



P-ISSN: 2349-8528  
 E-ISSN: 2321-4902  
 IJCS 2018; 6(6): 41-44  
 © 2018 IJCS  
 Received: 19-09-2018  
 Accepted: 23-10-2018

**Akanksha Pandey**

Ph.D. Scholar, Department of  
 Agril. Extension Indira Gandhi  
 Krishi Vishwavidyalaya Raipur,  
 Chhattisgarh, India

**HK Awasthi**

Professor, Department of Agril.  
 Extension Indira Gandhi Krishi  
 Vishwavidyalaya Raipur,  
 Chhattisgarh, India

## Study under impact of NFSM programme on cosmopolitan nature and input availability of farmers in northern hills of Chhattisgarh

**Akanksha Pandey and HK Awasthi**

**Abstract**

Cosmopolitanism is the tendency of an individual to be in contact with outside of his own community based on the belief that all the needs of an individual cannot be satisfied within his own community. Availability of various inputs viz. seed, fertilizers, insecticides, pesticides and other chemicals, biofertilizers, soil reclaiming elements etc. are very important factor of crop production. Results visualized that NFSM beneficiaries respondent were having more cosmopolitan outlook as compared to the non-beneficiaries i.e. maximum (45.83%) NFSM beneficiaries respondent were having medium level of cosmopolitan outlook majority (59.37%) of non-beneficiary respondents were having low level of cosmopolitan outlook respectively. In both categories NFSM beneficiary (88.54%) and non-beneficiaries (75%) respondents sometimes timely obtained various inputs of production that may be because most of the study area is hilly and remote area where transportation or other facilities are not good enough therefore all inputs are not available at the time. In order to find the facts objective of the study is; cosmopolitanism of the respondents in aspects of places of visiting and purpose of visiting, availability of inputs in aspects of timely availability, price of inputs, availability as per the requirement, place and distance of availability.

**Keywords:** cosmopolitanism, inputs, availability, NFSM, Chhattisgarh

**Introduction**

Now in these days we will have to feed more and more people with different limited natural phenomenon like scarce water resources, recurring droughts, degrading lands and difficult access to energy, therefore the agricultural technologies need to shift from production oriented to demand oriented sustainable farming system to achieving the nutritional food security in the country as well as world. One-third of India's population is estimated to be absolutely poor and one-half of the children's are malnourished. Food availability is a very necessary condition for food and nutritional security. Furthermore, food production in India suffers from a huge demand and supply gap which is amplified by food wastage and also the lack of adequate storage facilities have compounded to the problem.

For achieving the envisaged objectives of NFSM programme, mandated to adopt following strategies; speedy implementation of programmes through active engagement of all the stakeholders at various levels, promotion and extension of improved technologies i.e., seed, Integrated Nutrient Management including micronutrients, soil amendments, Integrated Pest Management and resource conservation technologies along with capacity building of farmers, Flow of fund would be closely monitored to ensure that interventions reach the target beneficiaries on time, the proposed interventions would be integrated with the targets fixed for each identified district in the existing District Plan and constant monitoring and concurrent evaluation for assessing the impact of the interventions for a result oriented approach by the implementing agencies.

**Materials and Methods**

Chhattisgarh state has three Agro-climatic zones i.e. Northern Hills, Baster plateau and Chhattisgarh plains. Out of these, study was conducted in Northern hills Agro-climatic zone of Chhattisgarh state during the year 2014-2015. In this way the study was conducted in Surguja, Surajpur, Jashpur and Balrampur district districts which were having National Food Security Mission Programme (NFSM) in selected crops for the study. Out of total blocks of these selected districts, 08 blocks were selected for the study. In this way total 288 (beneficiaries

**Correspondence**

**Akanksha Pandey**

Ph.D. Scholar, Department of  
 Agril. Extension Indira Gandhi  
 Krishi Vishwavidyalaya Raipur,  
 Chhattisgarh, India

192 and non-beneficiaries 96) respondents were selected randomly from 16 selected villages with purpose to collect the data. The data were collected personally with help of interview schedule developed for the collection of data. Collected data were analyzed with the help of suitable statistical methods.

## Results and Discussion

### Cosmopolitanism of the respondents

To develop an understanding about the nature of cosmopolitanism of beneficiaries and Non-beneficiaries respondents were classified into three categories, i.e. low level (once in a month), medium level (once in a week) and high level (twice or more in a week). Distribution of respondents frequencies were counted and converted into percentage for all the categories of respondents.

The results regarding cosmopolitan outlook data were presented in Table 1. The data included in the Table 1 visualize that maximum (45.83%) beneficiaries respondent were medium level of cosmopolitan outlook followed by 44.27 per cent low level and only 9.89 per cent respondents were high level of cosmopolitan outlook respectively.

Regarding non-beneficiaries results depicted that majority (59.37%) of respondents were having low level of cosmopolitan outlook followed by 33.33 per cent medium level and only 7.29 per cent high level of cosmopolitan outlook.

In the light of above results it can be concluded that NFSM beneficiaries respondent were having more cosmopolitan

outlook as compared to the non-beneficiaries.

Respondent's place of visiting is described in four different places i.e. block, district, out of district, other States and presented in Table 1. Data shows that most (55.72%) of beneficiary respondents visiting district for their works followed by 31.77 per cent visiting block, 9.89 per cent visiting out of district and only 2.60 per cent were visiting other states respectively. Whereas, most (46.87%) of non-beneficiaries respondent visiting block followed by 41.66 per cent visiting district, 10.41 per cent out of district and only 1 per cent visiting other State respectively.

In the study area different Purpose of visiting in different places was identified i.e. to purchase agricultural inputs (seed, fertilizers, pesticides, equipment etc.), family work visit, cultural or general visit, for health issues, grocery or other shopping. Regarding beneficiaries majority (66.14%) respondents were visited for their different health issues followed by 58.33 per cent to purchase agricultural inputs (seed, fertilizers, pesticides, equipment etc.), 30.72 per cent grocery or other shopping's, 25 per cent family work visits and 11.97 per cent visiting for cultural or general purpose respectively.

In case of non-beneficiaries majority (70.83%) respondents were visited to purchase different agricultural inputs (seed, fertilizers, pesticides, equipment etc) followed by 67.70 per cent were visited for their different health issues, 26.04 per cent family work visits, 20.83 per cent visits for grocery or other shopping and only 18.75 per cent for cultural or general visits respectively.

**Table 1:** Distribution of respondents according to their cosmopolitanism.

SI. No.	Categories	Beneficiary n=192		Non-beneficiary n=96		Over all respondents n=288	
		F	%	F	%	F	%
A	Cosmopolitanism						
1	Low (once in a month)	85	44.27	57	59.37	142	49.30
2	Medium (once in a week)	88	45.83	32	33.33	120	41.66
3	High (twice or more in a week)	19	9.89	7	7.29	26	9.02
B	Places of visiting						
1	Block	61	31.77	45	46.87	106	36.80
2	District	107	55.72	40	41.66	147	51.04
3	Out of district	19	9.89	10	10.41	29	10.06
4	Out of State	5	2.60	1	1.04	6	2.08
C	Purpose of visiting*						
1	To Purchase agricultural inputs (seed, fertilizers, pesticides, equipment etc)	112	58.33	68	70.83	180	62.5
2	Family work visit	48	25.00	25	26.04	73	25.34
3	Cultural or general visit	23	11.97	18	18.75	41	14.23
4	For health issues	127	66.14	65	67.70	192	66.66
5	Grocery or other shopping	59	30.72	20	20.83	79	27.43

\*Multiple responses, F= Frequency and %= Percentage

The present findings are in line with the findings of Khatik R.L. 2017 noted that the proportion of gram beneficiary and non-beneficiary farmers were 25.00 and 22.50 per cent in high level of cosmopolitan outlook respectively.

### Availability of inputs

An input supply is a critical factor for agricultural and rural development, inputs refers to seeds (improved quality seeds), fertilizers (organic or chemical), and agrochemicals (pesticides, herbicides and insecticides), farm machineries etc. For agriculture it is very essential that, farm inputs need to be available, affordable, accessible, and good quality. The inputs such as seeds, fertilizers, and agro-chemicals, are essential for improving the productivity and incomes of farmers. The availability of inputs in study area is classified in four categories of availability i.e. timely availability inputs, price

of available inputs, Availability of inputs as per the requirement, place and distance of availability. The results were presented in Table 2.

To develop an understanding about the timely availability inputs, respondents they were classified into three categories, i.e. Always, Sometimes and Never. It is evident from the Table 2 that majority (88.54%) of beneficiary respondents sometimes obtained timely inputs which is followed by 7.81 per cent always timely inputs obtained and only 3.65 per cent never obtained timely availability of inputs in study area. Whereas, majority (75%) of non-beneficiaries respondents sometimes obtained timely inputs followed by 25 per cent never obtained timely inputs.

The results may concluded that overall majority (84.03%) of respondents sometimes obtained timely inputs and only 5.21 per cent always obtained timely inputs while 10.76 per cent

never obtained timely inputs for their farm production. From the above facts, it can be concluded that nearly half of respondents obtained sometimes timely availability of inputs may be because most of the study area is hilly and remote

area where transportation or other facilities are not so good therefore all inputs are not available at the time. The results supported by the findings of Sivagnanam K. J. 2015<sup>[3]</sup> reported that the timely availability of material is very essential.

**Table 2:** Distribution of respondents according to the availability of inputs.

SI. No.	Particulars	Beneficiaries (n=192)		Non beneficiaries (n=96)		Overall respondents (n=288)	
		F	%	F	%	F	%
A	<b>Timely availability inputs</b>						
1	Always	15	7.81	0	0.00	15	5.21
2	Sometimes	170	88.54	72	75.00	242	84.03
3	Never	7	3.65	24	25.00	31	10.76
B	<b>Price of inputs</b>						
1	As per printed rate	164	85.41	88	91.67	252	87.5
2	More than printed rate	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
3	Less than printed rate	28	14.58	8	8.33	36	12.5
C	<b>Availability as per the requirement</b>						
1	Always	30	15.63	2	2.08	32	11.11
2	Sometimes	162	84.38	82	85.42	244	84.72
3	Never	0	0.00	12	12.50	12	4.17
D	<b>Place and Distance of Availability</b>						
1	Available at village	7	3.65	20	20.83	27	9.38
2	Available near village	7	3.65	0	0.00	7	2.43
3	Away from village	178	92.71	76	79.17	254	88.19

F= Frequency and %= Percentage

Regarding the price of available inputs, respondents were grouped in three categories i.e. as per printed rate, more than printed rate, less than printed rate. On perusal of the data in Table 2 revealed that majority (85.41%) of the beneficiary respondents bear as per printed rate price of inputs in study area and 14.58 per cent respondents bear less than printed rate price of inputs. No respondents were bear more than printed rate price of input in study area. Whereas, majority (91.67%) of non-beneficiaries respondent bear as per printed rate price of inputs only 8.33 per cent respondents bear less than printed rate price of inputs and no respondents were bear more than printed rate price of inputs. It may concluded that majority (87.5%) of respondents bear as per printed rate price of inputs and 12.5 per cent had bear less than printed rate price of inputs. No respondents were bear more than printed rate price of inputs it is may be because respondents were enough aware and well educated in the study area.

About the availability as per the requirement of inputs results depicts that majority (84.38%) of NFSM beneficiary respondents received inputs sometimes as per their requirement of farm production and only 15.63 per cent received inputs always as per their requirement. No respondents were never received inputs as per the requirements. In case of non-beneficiaries majority (85.42%) of respondents received inputs sometimes as per their requirement and 12.50 per cent never received inputs as per the requirement. Only 2.08 per cent of non-beneficiaries respondents received inputs always as per their requirement. From the above facts, it can be concluded that majority (84.72%) of overall respondents sometimes received inputs as per the requirement.

A comparative view of beneficiary and non-beneficiary data highlights that beneficiaries some were always received inputs as per requirement but no respondents from non-beneficiaries were always received inputs as per requirement and also no beneficiary respondents were fell in never category but about 12.50 per cent non-beneficiaries were belonged to the never category to received availability as per the requirement of inputs.

Further results about place and distance of input availability, respondents were grouped in three categories i.e. available at village, available near village and away from village. About 92.71 per cent of beneficiary respondents had purchase inputs away from their village, followed by 3.65 per cent respondents had purchase inputs at village and near village respectively. In case of Non-beneficiaries majority (79.17%) had inputs away from village and 20.83 per cent had purchase at village. From the above results it can be concluded that majority (88.19%) respondents had purchase inputs away from their village this may obviously because the study area is hilly and forest area so that respondents were purchase inputs from their nearby cities.

### Conclusion

From the enlightenment of the above results it should be concluded that beneficiaries were more cosmopolitan then the non-beneficiaries respondents it may be because of NFSM impact on beneficiary respondents that they were aware about new information and have contact with extension personal. So that they visit more often compare to non-beneficiaries. From the both categories respondents were not having availability of inputs timely that may be because most of the study area is hilly and remote area. Therefore, it is very important to create awareness among farmers about information and resources availability from the outside of their village or community so that they visit and explore opportunities. Also transportation structure and other facilities are developed in hilly and tribal based remote area so that farmers timely having various inputs of production.

### References

1. Khatik RL. Impact of National Food Security Mission with Special Reference to Recommended Pulse Interventions in Southern Rajasthan. Ph. D. Thesis. Department of Extension Education Rajasthan College of Agriculture Maharana Pratap University of Agriculture and Technology Udaipur, 2017.
2. Pandey A. Study on seed management pattern among the tribal farmers of Northern hills Agro-Climatic Zone of

Chhattisgarh state. M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis, IGKV, Raipur, Chhattisgarh, 2015.

3. Sivagnanam KJ. Impact of National Food Security Mission (NFSM) on input Use, Production, Productivity and Income in Tamil Nadu, 2015.
4. Walton CG. Food and Nutrition Security of Kenyan smallholder farm women Ph.D. Thesis Department of Health Management, University of Prince Edward Island, 2012.
5. Walton CG. Sustainable livelihoods and food and nutrition security of Kenyan smallholder farm women. Ph.D. Thesis of Health Management department, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, University of Prince Edward Island Canada, 2012.