



P-ISSN: 2349-8528
 E-ISSN: 2321-4902
 IJCS 2018; 6(5): 176-180
 © 2018 IJCS
 Received: 09-07-2018
 Accepted: 13-08-2018

Rani A Palaskar
 M.Sc. Scholar, Dept. of
 Extension Education, PGI, Dr.
 PDKV, Akola, Maharashtra,
 India

YB Shambharkar
 Assist. Professor, Dept. of
 Extension Education, PGI, Dr.
 PDKV, Akola, Maharashtra,
 India

Mukta G Solanke
 M.Sc. Scholar, Dept. of
 Extension Education, PGI, Dr.
 PDKV, Akola, Maharashtra,
 India

Neeta Deokate
 M.Sc. Scholar, Dept. of
 Extension Education, PGI, Dr.
 PDKV, Akola, Maharashtra,
 India

Correspondence
Rani A Palaskar
 M.Sc. Scholar, Dept. of
 Extension Education, PGI, Dr.
 PDKV, Akola, Maharashtra,
 India

Assessment of self-efficacy of farmers in distress prone area of Vidarbha

Rani A Palaskar, YB Shambharkar, Mukta G Solanke and Neeta Deokate

Abstract

The present study entitled "Assessment of self-efficacy of farmers in distress prone area of Vidarbha" was undertaken in Buldhana districts of Vidarbha region of Maharashtra state and the exploratory research design was used for the study. A total sample comprising 120 respondents were selected from ten villages by using random sampling method. The data was collected with the help of pre-tested interview schedule by personally interviewing the respondents and data were subjected to appropriate statistical analysis. In this investigation it is found that, out of 120 respondents, 67.50 per cent of respondents were observed in medium level of self-efficacy.

Keywords: self-efficacy, economic motivation, self-esteem, innovativeness, distress, health of respondents

Introduction

In the modern era no one is fully satisfied in his or her life because of changing lifestyle of the peoples and their needs. Farmers are no exception to this. Farming is one of the most stressful occupations which deteriorating the quality of life of the farmers and committing suicide. Hence, by knowing the psychological variables of the farmers such as, self-efficacy this study will help to improve the quality of life and lessen the farmer's suicides by framing the suitable policy framework. Self-efficacy of farmers refers to judgment of his capabilities to organise and execute courses of action required to attain designated types of agricultural performance. Self-efficacious farmers have belief that they are more competitive, challenging, recognized, curious to know farming practices, able to understand social needs easily. When farmers have lost such belief, his self-efficacy system deteriorates and prolonged deterioration leads him to commit suicide or to take some other profession. The studies related to farmer's suicide provide conceptual base to understand different correlates of self-efficacy.

Methodology

Present study was carried out in the year 2017-18 with the jurisdiction of Dr. Panjabrao Deshmukh Krishi Vidyapeeth, Akola (Maharashtra State). The present investigation was undertaken in Buldhana district of the Vidarbha region of Maharashtra state. Amongst selected district, consecutive two tahsils where the more farmer suicidal cases were happened was selected purposively. Amongst selected tahsils five (05) villages, where the maximum number of the farmers committed suicides were selected purposively. Thus, from two tahsils 10 villages were selected. From the previous research studies, it is cleared that farmers are committing suicides due to dry land farming, indebtedness and crop failure and suicidal farmers were marginal, small and semi-medium.

Thus, the list of dry land farmers who are marginal, small and semi-medium having debt and continuous crop failure was obtained from Department of Agriculture/ Bank officers/Talathi/ from Collector office. From each selected village the 4 marginal, 4 small farmers and 4 semi-medium farmers who are in debt and crop failure during consecutive three years was selected purposively. Thus, from each selected village, 120 farmers were selected to constitute the sample size of 120 respondents from ten villages.

Results and Discussion

1. Annual income

Table 1: Distribution of the respondents according to their annual income

Sl. No.	Annual income (Rs.)	Respondents (n=120)	
		Frequency	Percentage
1	Up to 50,000/-	45	37.50
2	50,001/- to 1,00,000/-	47	39.16
3	1,00,001/- to 1,50,000/-	14	11.66
4	1,50,001/- to 2,00,000/-	09	7.52
5	Above 2,00,000/-	05	4.16
	Total	120	100.00

The bird eye view of Table 1 revealed that, relatively higher proportion (39.16%) of respondents comes under the annual income ranging between Rs.50,001/- to Rs.1,00,000/- followed by 37.50 per cent of them had annual income up to Rs.50,000/-. Whereas, 11.66 per cent of the respondents had annual income between Rs.1,00,001/- to Rs.1,50,000/- followed by 7.52 per cent of respondents comes under annual income ranging from Rs.1,50,001/- to Rs.2,00,000/-. Very meager of (4.16%) of respondents were observed in having annual income above Rs.2,00,000/-.

Thus, it is concluded from above findings that relatively higher proportion (39.16%) of respondents comes under the annual income ranging between Rs.50,000/- to Rs.1,00,000/-.

2. Innovativeness

It is the degree to which an individual adopts new ideas relatively earlier than others in his social system.

Table 3: Distribution of the respondents' according to their self esteem

Sl. No.	Statements	Agree		Cannot say		Disagree	
		Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
1	I feel that I am a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others	57	47.50	31	25.84	32	26.66
2	I feel that I have a number of good quality	95	76.16	09	7.51	16	13.33
3	All in all I am inclined to feel that I am a failure	25	20.83	11	9.17	84	70.00
4	I am able to do things as well as most of the other people	84	70.00	11	9.17	25	20.83
5	I feel I do not have much to be proud of	42	35.00	15	12.50	63	52.50
6	I take a positive attitude towards myself	101	84.16	00	00.00	19	15.84
7	On the whole I am satisfied with myself	48	40.00	04	3.34	68	56.66
8	I wish I could have more respect to myself	112	93.33	08	6.67	00	00.00
9	I certainly feels useless at times	43	35.83	20	16.67	57	47.50
10	At times I think I am no good at all	43	35.83	20	16.67	57	47.50

All in all I am inclined to feel that I am a failure, 70.00 per cent of them were disagree to this statement whereas, 20.83 per cent of the respondents were agree to this statement and 9.17 per cent were in opinion of can not say. In connection to the statement I am able to do things as well as most of the other people, 70.00 per cent of the respondents were agree to this statement and 20.83 per cent of them were disagree whereas, only 9.17 per cent of the respondents were in thinking of cannot say. In case of the statement as I feel I do not have much to be proud of, little more than half of the respondents (52.50%) were disagree to this statement followed by 35.00 per cent of them were agree to the same and 12.50 per cent of respondents were said cannot say. I take a positive attitude towards myself with this statement large majority (84.16%) of the respondents were agree to this statement whereas, 15.84 per cent of them were disagree and none of them were can not say in opinion to this statement. In connection to the statement as On the whole I am satisfied with myself, 56.66 per cent of the respondents were disagree followed by 40.00 per cent of them were agree and little (3.34%) were said cannot say. I wish I could have more respect for myself, large majority of the respondents (93.33%)

Table 2: Distribution of the respondents according to their level of innovativeness

Sl. No.	Innovativeness level	Respondents (n=120)	
		Frequency	Per cent
1.	Low (Up to 12)	32	26.67
2.	Medium (13 to 18)	78	65.00
3.	High (Above 18)	10	8.33
	Total	120	100.00

It is revealed from the Table 2 that, maximum number (65.00%) of the respondents had medium innovativeness whereas, rests distributed within low and high category i.e. 26.67 per cent and 8.33 per cent respectively.

3. Self esteem

It is evident from Table 3 that, The little less than half (47.50%) of respondents were agree to the statement as I feel that I am a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others followed by little more than one fourth of the respondents (26.66%) were disagree to this statement and 25.84 per cent of them said can not say. In case of the statement, I feel that I have a number of good quality, 76.16 per cent of the respondents were agree to this statement and 13.33 per cent of them were disagree whereas, only 7.51 per cent of the respondents were said cannot say.

were agree to this statement followed by 6.67 per cent of them said cannot say and none of them were disagree in opinion to this statement.

Little less than half (47.50%) were agree to the statement that I certainly feel useless at times followed by 35.83 per cent and one fifth that is (16.67%) of the respondents were agree and cannot say continuum respectively. At times I think I am no good at all in this regards 47.50 per cent, 35.83 per cent and little less than one fifth (16.67%) were disagree, agree and cannot say in opinion respectively.

Table 4: Distribution of respondents according to their level of Self esteem

Sl. No.	Self-esteem level	Frequency	Percentage
1	Low (up to 62.50)	21	17.50
2	Medium (62.51 to 80.74)	87	72.50
3	High (above 80.74)	12	10.00
	Total	100	120

Mean=71.62 SD=9.12

Table 4 indicated that, majority (72.50%) of the respondents were observed in medium level of self-esteem followed by

17.50 per cent of respondents were observed in low level of self-esteem and 10.00 per cent of respondents were observed in high level of self-esteem.

4. Economic motivation

In order to understand the level of economic motivation, pertinent data were collected and the details are presented below in Table 5

Table 5: Distribution of the respondents according to their level of economic motivation

Sl. No.	Economic motivation level	Respondents (n=120)	
		Frequency	Per cent
1.	Low (Up to 20)	24	20.00
2.	Medium (21 to 25)	71	59.17
3.	High (Above 25)	25	20.83
Total		120	100.00

It can be clearly observed from Table 6 that, relatively higher proportion (59.17%) of the respondents had medium economic motivation followed by little more than one fifth (20.83%) and one fifth (20.00%) respondents who had high and low level of economic motivation respectively.

It is concluded that relatively higher proportion of respondents belonged to medium economic motivation.

6. Crop failure

Table 6: Distribution of the respondents according to their crop failure

Sl. No.	Major crop failed	Number of times					
		3 or more		2		1	
		Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
1.	Soybean	61	50.88	39	32.49	26	21.67
2.	Cotton	55	45.83	45	37.50	20	16.67
3.	Wheat	31	25.83	49	40.83	40	33.34
4.	Gram	42	35.00	55	45.84	17	14.17
5.	Green gram / Black gram	35	21.17	58	48.33	27	22.50

The data from the Table 6 clearly indicates that, slightly more than half (50.88%) of the respondents experienced crop failure 3 times in soybean crop followed by 45.83 per cent experienced crop failure up to 3 times in cotton followed by 35.00 per cent, 25.83 per cent and 21.17 per cent were experienced crop failure 3 times in gram, wheat, and green gram/black gram crop respectively. While 48.33 per cent, 45.84 per cent and 40.83 per cent of the respondents experienced crop failure 2 times in black gram/green gram, gram and wheat crop respectively. Whereas, 37.50 per cent and 32.49 per cent of the respondents experienced crop failure in cotton and soybean crop respectively while 33.34 per cent, 22.50 per cent, 21.67 per cent, 16.17 per cent and 14.17 per cent of the respondents experienced crop failure only 1 time in wheat, green gram/black gram, soybean, and cotton and gram crop respectively.

From the above findings it can be concluded that soybean and cotton are the major crops grown in Buldhana district in which both crop got failure in more times may be due to fluctuation in weather conditions.

7. Health of the respondent

Table 7: Distribution of the respondents according to their health

Sl. No.	Health of the respondent	Respondents (n=120)	
		Frequency	Percentage
1.	Health problem found	57	47.50
2.	Health problem not found	63	52.50
Total		120	100.00

The Table 7 clearly indicate that, little more than half of the respondents (52.50%) were found free from health problems whereas 47.50 per cent respondents were having their health problems

From the above findings it can be revealed that little more than half of the respondents were found free from health problem.

8. Indebtedness

Table 8: Distribution of the respondents according to their indebtedness

Sr. No.	Indebtedness (Rs)	Respondents (n=120)	
		Frequency	Percentage
1.	Up to 50,000/-	16	13.33
2.	50,001/- to 1,00,000/-	29	24.17
3.	1,00,001/- to 1,50,000/-	36	30.00
4.	1,50,001/- to 2,00,000/-	19	15.83
5.	Above 2,00,000/-	20	16.67
Total		120	100

Data depicted in Table 8 revealed that, little less than one third (30.00%) of the respondents had debt between Rs.1,00,001/- to RS. 1,50,000/- followed by little less than one fourth (24.17%) of the respondents had debt between RS. 50,001/- to RS. 1,00,000/-. Whereas, 16.67 per cent of the respondents had debt above RS. 2,00,000/- while 15.83 per cent of the respondents had debt between RS. 1,50,001/- to RS. 2,00,000/- and only 13.33 per cent of the respondents had debt up to RS. 50,000/-.

It could be concluded from the findings that little less than one third (30.00%) of the respondents had debt between RS. 1,00,001/- to RS. 1,50,000/-.

Self-efficacy

Table 9 indicated that, opinion about successful farmer little less than half (49.17%), 40.83 per cent and 10.00 per cent of the respondents were disagree, agree and can not say in opinion about this statement respectively. About Peoples opinion of cultivation of field, relatively higher proportion (67.50%), 20.00 per cent and 12.50 per cent of the respondents were in opinion of agrees, disagree and cannot say respectively. About no difficulty to use new agricultural procedures, 59.17 per cent and 40.83 per cent of the respondents were agree and disagree in opinion respectively while none of them were can not say in opinion to this statements. In case of dealing with any agricultural problems 43.33 per cent, 40.83 per cent and 15.84 per cent of the respondents were in agree, cannot say and disagree in opinion respectively.

With regards to the statement as i cannot grow good amount of crops if I would be away from traditional agricultural practices, 51.66 per cent, 24.18 per cent and 24.16 per cent of

the respondents were agree, disagree and cannot say in opinion respectively. In case of statements I cannot use all my capacities to be a successful farmer, 42.50 per cent, 40.83 per cent and 16.67 per cent of the respondents were disagree, agree and cannot say to this statement respectively. In case of the statement comparing with others, I grow more amount of crops, 57.50 per cent and 42.50 per cent of the respondents were disagree and agree in opinion respectively while none of them were can not say in opinion to this statement. I am failure in agricultural competition, 54.16 per cent, 41.68 per cent and 4.16 per cent of the respondents were agree, disagree and cannot say in opinion respectively. In case of statement as no one can defeat me in crop production, 45.83 per cent, 39.17 per cent and 15.00 per cent of the respondents agree, disagree and cannot say in opinion to these statements respectively.

In case of statement as I can understand any sort of agricultural discussion, 62.50 per cent, 20.83 per cent and 16.67 per cent of the respondents disagree, agree and cannot say in opinion respectively. I can grow crops whether there would be any drought or heavy shower, 55.00 per cent, 45.00 per cent of the respondent disagree and agree in opinion respectively whereas none of them were disagree in opinion to this statement. To grow good crops, I can do more work, 67.50 per cent, 25.00 per cent and 7.50 per cent of the respondents were agree, disagree and cannot say in opinion respectively. With regards to the statement I am proud of being a successful farmer, 50.83 per cent, 43.33 per cent and

5.84 per cent of the respondents were disagree, agree, and cannot say in opinion respectively. In case of statement as I imitate good farmers, 47.50 per cent, 45.84 per cent and 6.66 per cent of the respondents were agree, cannot say and disagree in opinion about this statement. In case of the statement as I brood as how to get good crops, 72.50 per cent and 27.50 per cent of the respondents were agree and disagree in opinion respectively while none of them were can not say in opinion to this statement.

In case of the statement, I do not like to think much about less production 82.50 per cent and 17.50 per cent of the respondents were agree and disagree in opinion respectively while none of them were can not say in opinion to this statement. With regards to the statement as Always I try to remove all troubles in agriculture, 43.34 per cent, 40.83 per cent and 15.83 per cent of the respondents were can not say, agree and disagree in opinion respectively. With regards to the statement as If luck favors, there are good amount of crops, 82.50 per cent and 17.50 per cent of the respondents were agree and disagree respectively while none of the respondent were can not say in opinion to this statement. In case of finding reasons when I get good crops, 44.16 per cent, 31.66 per cent and 24.18 per cent of the respondents were agree, disagree and cannot say in opinion respectively. Whereas, 55.00 per cent and 45.00 per cent of the respondents were agree and disagree in opinion to the statement as it is useless to devote much time to think about agriculture while none of them were can not say in opinion to this statement.

Table 9: Distribution of the respondents according their opinion about self-efficacy

Sl. No.	Statements	Agree		Can Not Say		Disagree	
		Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
1	Everyone knows that I am a successful farmer.	49	40.83	12	10.00	59	49.17
2	People say that I can cultivate well.	81	67.50	15	12.50	24	20.00
3	I have no difficulty to use new agricultural procedures.	71	59.17	00	00.00	49	40.83
4	I am success in dealing with any agricultural problems.	52	43.33	49	40.83	19	15.84
5	I cannot grow good amounts of crops if I would be away from traditional agricultural practices.	62	51.66	29	24.16	29	24.18
6	I cannot use all my capacities to be a successful farmer.	49	40.83	20	16.67	51	42.50
7	Comparing with others, I grow more amounts of crops.	51	42.50	00	00.00	69	57.50
8	I am failure in agricultural completion.	65	54.16	05	4.16	50	41.68
9	No one can defeat me in crop production.	55	45.83	18	15.00	47	39.17
10	I can understand any sort of agricultural discussion.	25	20.83	20	16.67	75	62.50
11	I can grow crops whether there would be any drought or heavy shower.	54	45.00	00	00.00	66	55.00
12	To grow good crops, I can do more work.	81	67.50	09	7.50	30	25.00
13	I am proud of being a successful farmer.	52	43.33	07	5.84	61	50.83
14	I imitate good farmers.	57	47.50	55	45.84	08	6.66
15	I brood as how to get god crops.	87	72.50	00	00.00	33	27.50
16	I do not like to think much about less production.	99	82.50	00	00.00	21	17.50
17	Always I try to remove all troubles in agriculture.	49	40.83	52	43.34	19	15.83
18	If luck favours, there are good amount of crops.	99	82.50	00	00.00	21	17.50
19	I want to find reasons when I get good crops.	53	44.16	29	24.18	38	31.66
20	It is useless to devote much time to think about agriculture.	66	55.00	00	00.00	54	45.00

Table 10 revealed that, relatively higher proportion of the respondents (67.50%) were observed in medium level of self-efficacy followed by little less than one fifth (18.33%) and 14.17 per cent who were observed in low and high level of self-efficacy respectively.

The present findings of the study are in consistent with the findings of previous research studies conducted in Anonymous (2017) had reported similarly observation wherein similar respondents belong to medium level of self-efficacy.

Table 10: Distribution of the respondents according to their levels of self-efficacy

Sl. No.	Self-efficacy Level	Respondents (n=100)	Percentage
1	Low	22	18.33
2	Medium	81	67.50
3	High	17	14.17

Correlation analysis was carried out to find out as to whether the selected profile of respondents had any association with self-efficacy of respondents. The coefficients of correlation of

the selected profile with self-efficacy have been furnished in Table 11.

Table 11: Correlation coefficients of self-efficacy with independent variables

Sl. No.	Independent variables	'r' value
1	Annual income	0.397**
2	Innovativeness	0.234**
3	Self esteem	0.239*
4	Economic motivation	0.252*
5	Crop failure	0.642**
6	Health of respondent	0.258*
7	Indebtedness	-0.287**

** = Significant at 1 per cent level of significance

* = Significant at 5 per cent level of significance

NS =Non-Significant

It can be inferred from Table 11 that, the calculated correlation co-efficient between self-efficacy of respondents and selected profile result clearly indicated that out of 6 variables, annual income, innovativeness and crop failure showed positive and significant correlation with self-efficacy at 0.01 level of probability which means that in the adverse condition respondents were in confidence to sustain the bad situation with positive thinking whereas, self-esteem, economic motivation and health of respondent showed positive and significant correlation with self-efficacy at 0.05 level of probability whereas indebtedness showed negative and significant correlation with self-efficacy at 0.01 level of probability.

Conclusion

Over all it is concluded from the study that, maximum number of the selected farmers in the suicide prone district Buldhana, were having self-efficacy at medium level. To increase and sustain the self-efficacy level of the farmers in distress prone area of Buldhana district, Government has to create multiple livelihood opportunities in the off-farm and non-farm areas. It is therefore, recommended that, health department, extension functionary, NGO's and other private organizations have to develop and strengthen these aspects among the distress farmers by organizing frequent training and counseling, with the cooperation of local leaders and social workers which will help to minimize the rate of suicides of the farmers.

References

1. Alias J Crum, Peter Salovey. Department of Psychology, Yale University; Shawn Achor, Good Think, Cambridge, Massachusetts. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 2013; 104(4):716-73.
2. Anonymous. Assessment Self Efficacy and Stress Mindsets Measures of the farmers in Distress Prone Area of Vidarbha. Joint Agrosco Project Dr. PDKV, Akola, 2017, 37-54.
3. Bandura Albert 1986. *Social Foundations of Thought and Action: A Social Cognitive Theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall. ISBN 978-0-13-815614-5.
4. Bandura A. Negative self-efficacy and goal effects revisited. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 2003; 88(1):87-99.
5. Rosenberg M. *Society and the adolescent self-image*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1965.

6. Roy D. Self-Efficacy of Agricultural Farmers: A Case Study. *Journal of the Indian Academy Psychology*. 2009; 35(2)323-293.
7. Schwarzer R, Jerusalem M. Generalized Self-Efficacy scale. In J. Weinman, S. Wright, & M. Johnston, *Measures in health psychology: A user's portfolio. Causal and control beliefs* Windsor, UK: NFER-NELSON, 1995, 35-37P.