

Study The Impact On Socio-Economic Development Of Tribal People Of Ranchi District In Jharkhand Through CSR Implanted Project.

Mayur Gautam¹ and Dr. Virendra B. Shahare²

This work was carried out in collaboration with both authors. Author MG designed the study, performed the statistical analysis, wrote the protocol, and first draft of the manuscript. Author VBS guided and supervised the analyses of the study. The authors have read and approved the final manuscript.

ABSTRACT

The study was conducted in Ormanjhi Block of Hutup village in Ranchi district of Jharkhand, to find out the impact of agricultural development through CSR fund and their impact on socio-economic status of farmers. It was observed that the socio-economic condition of farmers under CSR fund implanted project village was better than those of non-adopted village. Farmers of CSR fund adopted village were more educated, had smaller family size, higher farm employment and income possessed pucca and semi pucca house, modern facilities and agricultural implement like tractor, pumpset, thresher, chaff cutter etc. The components of farming system were also more in CSR fund programmed adopted village. The result indicated positive impact of agricultural development on well being of rural farmers. The outcome of study expected to be of immense help to policy maker, planner, technocrats and administrator to deal with a rural problem effectively and adopt more villages for agriculture development under CSR fund.

Key words – Socio-economic, Agricultural developed village, under developed village, CSR Fund.

-
1. Ph.D Research Scholar, Department of Social Work, Jamia Millia Islamia University, New Delhi, India.
 2. Professor, Department of Social Work, Jamia Millia Islamia University, New Delhi, India.

Introduction

Agriculture is the main stay of Indian economy. Agriculture and allied sectors contribute nearly 22 percent to gross domestic product (GDP) of India, while about 65-70 percent of the population is dependent on agriculture for their livelihood. It astonishes that even after more than 60 years of independence 26% of population remains below poverty line. Lack of Agriculture development is one of the major causes of such situation. There are various factors which are involved in agricultural development like land development, cropping system, cropping intensity, rain water management, improved agricultural implements and electrification that affect the social and occupational structure of rural communities. The last 10 years have witnessed an unprecedented rise in vegetable production in Jharkhand Positive changes in socio-economic status of rural people were also noticed but in some part effect of a agriculture development on rural social life was very less, with large number of rural population of state living below poverty line (60%). Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) is emerging concept in era of corporate economy, which suggests that it is the responsibility of the corporations operating within society to contribute towards economic, social and environmental development that creates positive impact on society at large and the poorest of poor. In Jharkhand so many companies i.e. CMPDI, CCL, JREDA, JBVNL, SUSTA MARTIN, JSLPS, NTPC, JHARCRAFT, M.K.Pandey, JASLOLAMPF, and NABARD genuinely address social and environmental concerns, donate a certain share of their profits to charitable causes and whole heartily participated in the upliftment of their society. Usha Martin is one of the companies, which took Corporate Social Responsibility seriously more than four decades back. Working closely in partnership with communities, Usha Martin has been able to apply business principles and strategies to improve the overall quality of life in the regions with collaboration with Krishi Gram Vikas Kendra (KGVK) on an integrated and scalable model for sustainable development in and around its plants and mines in Ranchi, Ramgarh, Palamu, Saraikella -Kharsawan and West Singhbhum districts as well as in other adjoining areas in the state of Jharkhand. KGVK, that began its journey as the CSR unit of Usha Martin Limited has today established a presence in close to 300 villages (54 in the vicinity of plant and mines and around 250 in other areas) across 10 blocks in 5 districts of Jharkhand in eight domains i.e. Natural Resource Management, Resource Mobilization, Health, Nutrition and Sanitation, Energy Inclusion, Education, Women's empowerment, Capacity Building, Livelihood, and Financial Inclusion.

However, no empirical study has been conducted so far to measure the situation effectively on district level.

Therefore, the present study was taken under to study the impact of agricultural development on socio-economic status of farmers of Hutup village of Ormanjhi block of Ranchi district in Jharkhand where CSR funded agricultural development project was implemented by (KGVK).

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Hutup village under Ormanjhi block of Ranchi district in Jharkhand selected purposively for study where CSR funded project on different agriculture development programme is under operation and near by the village in same block selected purposively as control of the study.

Data on status of education, family size, land holding existing farming system, social participation, type of house, nature of employment, annual income, modern facilities etc were collected from 100 farm families from each village i.e. total 200 respondents come under the study. Data collected through pretested schedule. Simple analysis and (chi-square- x^2) test were used for interpretation of data for drawing valid conclusion.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Educational Status

Distribution of respondents based on status of education in adopted and non-adopted village under CSR funded programme is given in table-1

Table: 1- Distribution of respondents based on status of education in adopted and non-adopted village under CSR funded programme.

S.No.	Level of education	CSR Funded programme adopted village	Not adopted village	Total	Proportionate % of agriculturally developed to under developed
1	Illiterate	20 (20)	27 (27)	47(23.5)	42.56
2	Can sign only	27 (27)	29 (29)	56(28)	48.22
3	Primary school	26 (26)	28 (28)	54 (27)	48.15
4	High school	22 (22)	12 (12)	34(17)	64.71
5	Graduate	5 (5)	4 (4)	9 (4.5)	55.56
Total		100	100	200	
$X^2 = 33.6$ significant at 5% level					

Figures in parentheses indicate percentage of respondents.

Education is the most important factor by which knowledge/skill about new modern farm practices. The respondents were in to five groups and respondents from each group were studied in (Table-1) 5% respondents were graduate and 20% illiterate group in CSR Funded project adopted village, where as or not adopted village the corresponding figure were 4% and 27%

respectively. The highest proportion (64.7%) was observed for the respondents of high school followed by graduate (55.56%) and lowest (42.56%) to illiterate group in. Chi-square values (33.6) at 5% level indicated significant difference between respondents of adopted and not adopted village with regard to education. Synergistic effect between agricultural development and education of farmers has also been reported by Sharma (1979)

FAMILY SIZE

Distribution of respondents based on family size CSR funded adopted project village and non-adopted village given in table-2

Table – 2 Distribution of respondents based on family size CSR funded adopted project village and non adopted village.

S.No.	Family size of (no. members)	CSR Funded programme adopted village	Not adopted village	Total	Proportionate % of agriculturally developed to under developed
1	< 5 members	55 (55)	28 (28)	83	66.27
2	10-15	17 (17)	19 (19)	62	32.26
3	>15	8 (8)	11(11)	19	42.11
Total		100	100	200	
$X^2 = 2.36$ significant at 55% level					

Figures in parentheses indicate percentage of respondents.

Under family size, the respondents were categorized into four group i.e. up to 5, 5 to 10, 10 to 15, and more than 15 members (Table-2). The highest respondents belonged to family up to 5 members in CSR funded adopted (55%) and 5-10 members in non-adopted village (42%). The family of 5-10 members had second largest number of respondents in both categories of village. The family with > 15 members was in adapted and 11% in not adopted village. The proportionate was highest (66.27%) for the family size up to 5 members. However, the differences were non-significant. Therefore, it may be concluded that agricultural development did not affect family size.

OCCUPATION

Distribution of respondents according to farming system in CSR funded adopted project village and not adopted village given in table-3

Table – 3 Distribution of respondents according to farming system in CSR funded adopted project village and not adopted village.

S.No.	Occupation	CSR funded adopted village	not adopted village	Total	Proportionate % of agriculturally developed to under developed
1	Agriculture	17 (17)	26 (26)	43	39.54
2	Agri.+ Horticulture	18 (18)	40 (40)	58	31.04
3	Agri. + Hort. + Animal	55 (55)	30 (30)	85	64.71
4	Agri+Hort+Animal husbandry + fisheries	10 (10)	4 (4)	14	71.43
Total		100	100	200	
$X^2 = 8.30$ significant at 5% level					

Figures in parentheses indicate percentage of respondents.

Occupation is the also main factor, which affects the activities of the individuals. The respondents were categorized into four groups viz agricultural, Agricultural + Horticulture, Agricultural + Horticulture + Animal husbandry and Agriculture + Horticulture + Animal husbandry + Fisheries. (Table -3). In adopted village highest respondents (55%) belonged to the Agriculture + Horticulture + Animal husbandry group where as the corresponding value for this group was 30% in under developed village. But reverse trend was found for Agriculture + Horticulture group where in under adopted villages had 40% respondents while it was only 18% CSR funded project adopted village. There were minimum respondents in Agriculture + Horticulture + Animal Husbandry + Fisheries in both the categories of village. The highest proportionate (71.43%) of the respondents in. Agriculture + Horticulture + Animal husbandry + Fisheries group and lowest (31.04%) to practice Agriculture + Horticulture. The computed chi-square value 8.30 at 5% indicated significant difference between respondents of CSR funded project adopted to not adopted categories of village with regard to occupation. It happen due to increasing irrigated area in CSR funded adopted village due to construction of water harvesting structure created through project.

SOCIAL PARTICIPATION

Distribution of respondents based on social participation in CSR funded adopted project village and not adopted village given in table-4

Table -4 Distribution of respondents based on social participation in CSR funded adopted project village and not adopted village.

S.No.	Social Participation	CSR funded adopted village	not adopted village	Total	Proportionate % of agriculturally developed to under developed
1.	Nos. of membership in any organization	10 (10)	42 (42)	52	19.24
2.	Membership in one organization	26 (26)	38 (38)	64	40.63
3.	Membership of more than one organization	40(40)	12 (12)	52	76.93
4.	Office bearer	10 (10)	4 (4)	14	71.43
5.	Public leader	14 (14)	4 (4)	18	77.78
	Total	100	100	200	
$X^2 = 22.40$ significant at 5% level					

Figure in parentheses indicate percentage of respondents

The social participation has great influence on development. It plays a very important role in transfer of technology. To study the social participation of respondents, they were divided into five groups (Table-4). The highest respondents (40%) belonged to the group which has membership in more than one organization in CSR funded project adopted villages whereas 42% respondents in no membership in any organization in not adopted village group. The office bearers were minimum in both the villagers. The highest proportionate (77.78%) of respondents belonged to public leader and lowest (19.24%) to no membership in any organization categories (Table-4). As the computed chi-square value 22.4 indicated that there were highly significant difference between respondents belonging to the CSR funded project adopted village and not adopted village respect to social participation.

HOUSE STRUCTURE

Distribution of respondents based on house structure in CSR funded adopted project village and not adopted village given in table-5

Table -5 Distribution of respondents based on house structure in CSR funded adopted project village and not adopted village.

S.No.	House structure	CSR funded adopted village	Not adopted village	Total	Proportionate % of agriculturally developed to under developed
1-	Kachacha	29 (29)	42 (42)	71	40.85
2-	Pucca + Kachacha	22 (22)	48 (48)	70	31.43
3-	Pucca	51 (51)	10 (10)	61	83.61
	Total	100	100	200	
$X^2 = 39.60$ significant at 5% level					

Figures in parentheses indicate percentage of respondents.

With regards to the house structure, the respondents were categorized into three groups viz Kachcha, Kachcha + Pucca, Pucca (Tabel-5). The highest proportion of respondents (5.1%) had pucca house and lowest (22%) Pucca + Kachcha in not adopted village. But reverse trend was observed for under developed village which recorded the highest respondents under Pucca + Kachcha house (48%) and lowest under Pucca. (10%). The proportionate to CSR funded project adopted to not adopted respondents was highest in Pucca house (83.61%) and lowest in Pucca + Kachcha (31.43%). Computed chi-square value revealed that there were highly significant difference between the respondents of both village.

SIZE OF LAND HOLDING

Distribution of respondents according to the size of land holding in CSR funded adopted project village and not adopted village in given table-6

Table – 6 Distribution of respondents according to the size of land holding in CSR funded adopted project village and not adopted village.

S.No.	Size of holding	CSR funded adopted village	Not adopted village	Total	Proportionate % of agriculturally developed to under
-------	-----------------	----------------------------	---------------------	-------	--

					developed
1-	Marginal(< than 1 ha)	21 (21)	59 (59)	80	26.25
2.	Small upto 2 ha	58 (58)	38 (38)	96	60.42
3.	Large(> 4 ha)	21 (21)	3 (3)	24	87.5
	Total	100	100	200	
$X^2 = \text{significant at 5\% level}$					

Figures in parentheses indicate percentage of respondents.

Size of land holding is one of the most important factors affecting livelihood of the farmers. The respondents were categorized into three groups viz. marginal, small and large size land holding (Table -6). The highest respondents (58%) were small and lowest (21%) in both large and marginal categories in CSR funded project adopted village. Whereas not adopted village the highest (59%) and lowest (3%) of respondents were recorded in large size categories respectively. Singh (1973) also recorded similar findings in U.P. The proportionate of respondents was maximum (87.5%) with large size and lowest (26.25%) in marginal size farmers.

NATURE OF JOB

Distribution of respondents according to find of employment in CSR funded adopted project village and not adopted village given in table-7

Table -7 Distribution of respondents according to find of employment in CSR funded adopted project village and not adopted village.

S.No.	Nature of job	CSR funded adopted village	Not adopted village	Total	Proportionate % of agriculturally developed to under developed
1-	On farm	42 (42)	68 (68)	110	38.19
2.	Off farm	10 (10)	4 (4)	14	71.34
3.	On and off farm	48 (48)	28 (28)	76	63.16
	Total	100	100	200	
$X^2 = 28.8 \text{ significant at 5\% level}$					

Figures in parentheses indicate percentage of respondents.

The nature of job of the respondents was categorized in to three groups viz on farm, off farm and, on and off farm (Table-7). In CSR funded adopted village the highest percentage of

respondents earned employment from on and off farm sources, (48%) where as in under developed categories highest respondents had employment on farm sources (68%). The off farm group to CSR funded project adopted village and off farm group in not adopted village categories of village had the lowest respondents i.e. 10% and 4% respectively. The highest Proportionate (71.43%) of respondents were belonging to off farm and lowest (38.1%) to on farm. The computed chi-square value shows that there were highly significant differences between respondents belonging to adopted and not adopted categories village.

ANNUAL INCOME

Distribution of respondents according to annual income in CSR funded adopted project village and not adopted village given in table-8

Table -8 Distribution of respondents according to annual income in CSR funded adopted project village and not adopted village.

S.No.	Annual income	CSR funded adopted village	Not adopted village	Total	Proportionate % of agriculturally developed to under developed
1.	5000-10,000	7 (7)	29 (29)	36	19.46
2.	10,000- 15000	22 (22)	42 (42)	64	34.38
3.	>15000	71 (71)	29 (29)	100	71
	Total	100	100	200	
$X^2 = 17.87$ significant at 5% level					

Figures in parentheses indicate percentage of respondents.

Annual income is an important factor, which has been valued as means of increasing the use of modern farm practices. The annual income was categorized into three group viz Rs. 5000-10,000, Rs. 10000-15,000 and more than Rs. 15000 (Table-8) to CSR funded project adopted village had less percentage of respondents in Rs. 5000-10000 group (7%) than not adopted village (29%). Percentage of respondents of Rs. 10,000- 15,000 income group was (22%) in adopted village and (42%) in not adopted villages group. But respondents to income group of Rs. 15000 and above were higher in adopted village (71%) than not adopted village (29%). The proportionate of agriculturally developed respondents was highest to more than Rs. 15000 group (71%) and lowest (19.45%) in Rs. 5000-10,000 group (Table-8) the chi-square test was applied.

A significant value of X^2 shows that there was significant difference of annual income in adopted and not adopted village.

MODERN FACILITIES

Distribution of respondents according to possessed materials in CSR funded adopted project village and not adopted village given in table-9

Table -9 Distribution of respondents according to possessed materials in CSR funded adopted project village and not adopted village.

S.No.	Materials	CSR funded adopted village	Not adopted village	Total	Proportionate % of agriculturally developed to under developed
1.	Cycle	92 (92)	94 (94)	186	49.47
2.	Motorcycle	65 (65)	12 (12)	77	84.42
3.	Radio	72 (72)	40 (40)	112	64.29
4.	T.V.	42 (42)	14 (14)	56	75
5.	Tractor	9 (9)	-	9	100
6.	Thresher	6 (6)	1 (1)	7	85.72
7.	Pump set	71 (71)	6 (6)	77	92.21
8.	Chaff cutter	19 (19)	1 (1)	20	95
9.	Sprayer duster	9 (9)	1 (1)	10	90
	Total				
$X^2 = 40.06$ significant at 5% level					

Figures in parentheses indicate percentage of respondents.

In this study the percentage of respondents having cycle was higher in not adopted village but the respondents having motorcycle, TV, Tractor/Power tiller, Thresher, Pump set, chaff cutter and sprayer and duster was higher in CSR funded project adopted village. The Chi-square value (40.06) at 5% level indicated that there was significant difference between respondents of adopted and not adopted categories with respect to possessed materials.

CONCLUSIONS

This study revealed that in Hutup village of Ormanjhi block of Ranchi district of Jharkhand – state, there was significant difference between CSR funded project adopted village and not adopted village in respect to the socio-economic status of the people. Respondents of adopted village and not adopted village were 5% and 4% graduate, respectively; adopted village had change the pattern of occupation. In not adopted village employment of the people was in the

farm only. Resultantly, family income in the adopted village was markedly higher than that of not adopted village. A large number of respondents in agriculturally developed village category possessed pucca houses, costly household items, better communication and entertainment, and modern agricultural implements like tractor, power tiller, pump-sets, thresher, sprayer/duster than under developed village. The adoption of village under CSR funded project had positive impact on well being of rural farmers. These findings are very useful for government and policy maker in deciding and planning the programmes of agriculture development through CSR fund.

REFERENCES

Anonymous 2003. Economic Survey of India. Government of India pp: 213

Dinesh 1983. Effective of lab to land programme on socio-economic conditions of selected families ICAR, Ministry of Agriculture, New Delhi.

Sharma B.K. 1979. Coordination adult education programme with development work :
Krurukshetra XXV (13) :5

Singh M.P. 1973 : The factors affecting the adoption of oilseed in U.P. M.Sc. (Ag.) thesis.
Kanpur University, Kanpur