



# Attitude of NRLM Beneficiaries towards Livelihood Diversification in Baghelkhand Region of Madhya Pradesh, India

Ashutosh Singh Rajpoot <sup>a++\*</sup>, Parvez Rajan <sup>a#</sup>, Ajay Raut <sup>b†</sup>,  
A. Srivastava <sup>c‡</sup> and R. B. Singh <sup>c‡</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Department of Extension Education, JNKVV, Jabalpur, MP, India.

<sup>b</sup> ICAR-ATARI Zone-IX, JNKVV Jabalpur, MP, India.

<sup>c</sup> Jawaharlal Nehru Krishi Vishwa Vidyalaya, Jabalpur, MP, India.

## Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration among all authors. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

## Article Information

DOI: 10.9734/AJAEES/2023/v41i112283

## Open Peer Review History:

This journal follows the Advanced Open Peer Review policy. Identity of the Reviewers, Editor(s) and additional Reviewers, peer review comments, different versions of the manuscript, comments of the editors, etc are available here: <https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/109934>

Original Research Article

Received: 23/09/2023

Accepted: 28/11/2023

Published: 30/11/2023

## ABSTRACT

In the rural areas, people diversify because of geographical isolation, low quality physical infrastructure, under developing markets, resources scarcity, incidence of some natural disaster and agricultural failure etc. Considering the above statement, find researchable issues were recognize as What are the attitude of NRLM beneficiaries towards livelihood diversification?

<sup>++</sup> Ph.D. Scholar;

<sup>#</sup> Assistant Professor;

<sup>†</sup> Scientist;

<sup>‡</sup> Professor and Head;

\*Corresponding author: E-mail: ashu484001@gmail.com;

Livelihood diversification is one of the dynamic solutions that are now occurring in rural regions and acting as a catalyst for economic growth and development. To cope with changing situation, mitigate losses from crop failure, economic and environmental risk rural households are adopting various on-farm and off-farm strategies as drought-tolerant crops and mixed farming, vegetable and fruit production, animal husbandry, eggs and poultry, trade, formally employee, mining, manufacturing, construction, transport, carpentry, petty trade etc. The study was done during 2022-23 in Rewa and Shahdol districts under Baghelkhand region of Madhya Pradesh due to highest number of beneficiaries registered in respective districts under NRLM at state level. In this study Ex-post facto research design, and 3 percent proportionate random sampling technique under multi-stage procedures were adopted. Thus 221 respondents were selected which were personally interviewed by using interview schedule, to analyze the attitude of NRLM beneficiaries towards livelihood diversification. The results of the study revealed that 50.22 percent respondent had medium level of attitude towards livelihood diversification.

*Keywords: Attitude; livelihood diversification; beneficiaries; NRLM.*

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Livelihoods are the means people used to support themselves, to survive and to prosper. Agriculture-based livelihood is effect by several nature-induced risk and hazards such as floods, droughts, riverbank erosions, and embankment damages. The purpose of diversification is maintaining a various sources of earning throughout the year and make necessary adjustments based on changing circumstances to optimize the profits [1]. The trend in agriculture is moving from subsistence to sustainable farming, which give more emphasizes on diversifying sources of income [2]. More than half of the people 55 percent living in rural areas and still depend on agriculture for their primary source of income, but this is not a profitable way to continue since they are stuck in a system of low returns, rainfed conditions, prone to risk, lack of other profitable alternatives, inability to escape the impoverishing agrarian arrangement [3].

National Rural Livelihoods mission (NRLM) is one such government initiative to uplift the rural women by making them self-reliant and helps them in earning their livelihoods [4,5]. Vocational training mainly concerns itself with creating awareness regarding new technologies for improving rural people's livelihood security, conducting trainings for women to make them self-dependent in the farming community; and developing interest among the rural youth in agriculture [6]. In Van Dhan Vikas Kendra's (VDVK's) programme, tribals are trained and given working capital to do primary processing and value-added processing of minor forest products such as bamboo candles, hill brooms, and other items such as turmeric and cashew. As a result, these Kendra's will serve as a significant

milestone in the tribals' economic development [7]. "Rural youth have significant contributions to the local and national economy by being participated in Income generating activities (IGA's) such as vegetable production, nursery establishment, crop production, mushroom cultivation, bee keeping, livestock, goatry and poultry rising, cottage industry and small business etc. Unfortunately, the rural youth community is almost unknown to modern agricultural technology and has been left out from the main stream of economic development" [8-10]. The level of adoption of technology determines the level of productivity [11]. Goswami et. al. [4] revealed that attitude towards development program ( $r=0.47$ ) shows moderately positive correlation with psychological empowerment of women beneficiaries of NRLM. Payasi et al. [12] revealed that majority of the tribal farmers 60.00 percent had favourable attitude towards forest-based livelihood practices.

"Attitude is defined as the degree of positive or negative effect associated with some psychological object and is a very important component of behaviour as it plays significant role in forming the overt and covert behaviour of a tribal farmer" [13]. "The farmers' mentality affects how they diversify their sources of income. Attitude is nothing but the way of thinking or feeling about diversification" [14]. "It is found in the fact that some characteristic feeling or emotion is experienced as we expect accordingly some definite action. It is also influenced by so many factors like social factors, family, prejudices, personal experience, media exposure, educational and religious institutions and physical factors. The family is the most powerful source for the formation of attitudes"

[15]. The parents, elder brother or sister provide information about various things. Attitudes developed by an individual, whether positive or negative are the result of family influence, are very powerful and difficult to change. In this backdrop, the present study is carried out with the specific objectives to know the 'Attitude of NRLM beneficiaries towards livelihood diversification'.

## 2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

### 2.1 Research Design

Ex-post facto research design was used.

### 2.2 Sampling Technique

Multi-stage sampling techniques were adopted.

#### 2.2.1 Location of study

The Baghelkhand region of Madhya Pradesh comprises 7 districts namely Rewa, Shahdol, Umariya, Anupur, Satna, Sidhi, and Singrauli. Out of which two district namely Rewa and Shahdol were selected based on maximum number of beneficiaries registered in NRLM.

#### 2.2.2 Selection of block

Rewa and Shahdol district comprises nine and five blocks respectively, out of which two blocks namely Sirmour and Kulchuriyan from Rewa district similarly Jaisinghnagar and Burhar from Shahdol district were selected based on maximum number of beneficiaries. Thus total 4 blocks were selected.

#### 2.2.3 Selection of villages

Sirmour and Kulchuriyan blocks comprises 102 and 104 villages respectively as similar way Jaisinghnagar and Burhar blocks comprises 87 and 102 villages respectively. Out of these 4 villages will be selected randomly from each selected blocks. Thus total 16 villages will be selected.

#### 2.2.4 Selection of respondents

A list of respondents will be prepared from selected villages with the help of NRLM bureaucrats. For the final selection of respondent's, 3 percent proportionate random sampling techniques were adopted. Thus, the sample size for the study comprised of 221

NRLM beneficiaries. For the present study, primary and secondary data were also employed. Specifically, the attitudes of beneficiaries towards livelihood diversification were examined by using Reddy et. al. scale [15].

### 2.2.5 Data analysis

The attitude score of respondent calculated by adding up of scores obtained by him/her on all statements and are categorized into three groups as less favorable, favorable and more favorable category. This classification is based on the theoretical range of scores. High score of the scale implies that beneficiaries have higher level of willingness to pursue livelihood diversification and vice-versa for the lower scores of the scale.

## 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### 3.1 Attitude towards Livelihood Diversification

Table 1 clearly explored that out of total 221 respondents, 50.22 per cent respondents belong to favorable attitude towards livelihood diversification, followed by more favorable 28.51 percent and less favorable 21.27 percent. Thus, most of respondents have favourable attitude towards livelihood diversification. The rationale for the outcome is that respondents are aware towards importance of various sources of income and their benefit which mitigates the risk of agriculture failure which helps them to sustain and raise their level of living. The above results are in line with the findings of Mittra et. al. [16].

The data presented in Table 2 explored that, respondents had more favorable attitude with the statement "Livelihood diversification serves as an insurance to farmer during crisis" have rank first with 3.94 mean score, it might be due to earlier most of respondents have single source of income and during crop failure they stuck in financial crises, they can't sustain their family needs and on the other hand the farmer who had diversified sources of income, had less affected to failure of their occupation. Followed by Benefits of government scheme direct the people towards livelihood diversification got second ranked with 3.36 mean score, it might be due to through NRLM government subsidy for establishment of vegetable and fruits orchards, credit facility with 1 percent interest rate, post-harvest training as spices processing, packaging and so on. Livelihood diversifications do not arrest the migration of the farmers to towns have

third ranked with 3.14 mean score, Livelihood diversification is a strategy for risk mitigation have fourth rank with 3.10 mean score, it was cleared that the beneficiaries who have various sources of income are less affected by single occupation failure, Successive progress in one enterprise and wealth lead to livelihood diversification have fifth rank with 3.10 mean score, the probable reason for the statement was benefices who have the successive progress in one enterprise have high economic motivation, risk preferences, decision taker, have good management skill, opportunity seeker lead to beneficiaries for the diversification in other occupation. Livelihood diversification is a boon to farmer have sixth rank with 3.06 mean score,

Livelihood diversification leads to efficient utilization of resources have seventh rank with 3.04 mean score, Livelihood diversification increases the social status in the community have eighth rank with mean score 2.90, Social capital enables households to diversify in main sources of livelihood including farm and nonfarm activities have ninth rank with 2.83 mean score, Livelihood diversification does not ensure economic efficiency and sustainable livelihood have tenth rank with 2.81 mean score, Livelihood diversification provides no scope for acquiring new knowledge and skills have eleventh rank with 2.81 mean score, Scarcity of farm labor results in diversification to non-farm activities have twelfth rank with 2.70 mean score,

**Table 1. Distribution of beneficiaries according to their attitude towards livelihood diversification**

Categories	Frequency	Percentage
Less Favorable	47	21.27
Favorable	111	50.22
More Favorable	63	28.51
Total	221	100.00

**Table 2. Distribution of beneficiaries based on their mean score towards livelihood diversification**

S. No.	Statements	Mean	Rank
1.	Livelihood diversification is a boon to farmer.	3.06	VI
2.	Livelihood diversification serves as insurance to farmer during crisis.	3.94	I
3.	Livelihood diversifications do not arrest the migration of farmers to towns and cities.	3.14	III
4.	Livelihood diversification leads to efficient utilization of resources.	3.04	VII
5.	Livelihood diversification is a strategy for risk mitigation.	3.10	IV
6.	Livelihood diversification ensures livelihood insecurity.	2.49	XV
7.	Livelihood diversification does not ensure economic efficiency and sustainable livelihood.	2.81	X
8.	Successive progress in one enterprise and wealth lead to livelihood diversification.	3.10	V
9.	Benefits of government scheme direct the people towards livelihood diversification.	3.36	II
10.	Competitive spirit among the people promotes livelihood diversification.	2.61	XIII
11.	Scarcity of farm labor results in diversification to non-farm activities.	2.70	XII
12.	Livelihood diversification provides no scope for acquiring new knowledge and skills.	2.81	XI
13.	Livelihood diversification increases the social status in the community.	2.90	VIII
14.	It gives me happy when others respect me for adopting livelihood diversification.	2.60	XIV
15.	Social capital enables households to diversify in main sources of livelihood including farm and nonfarm activities.	2.83	IX

Competitive spirit among the people promotes livelihood diversification have thirteen rank with 2.61 mean score, It gives me happy when others respect me for adopting livelihood diversification have fourteen rank with 2.60 mean score, and last fifteen rank statement was Livelihood diversification ensures livelihood insecurity with their least mean value 2.49., the findings is supported by Reddy et. al. [15].

#### 4. CONCLUSION

The results of the study explore that that majority of respondents as 50.22 percent had the favourable attitude towards livelihood diversification. It may be concluded that, respondent's attitude on diversifying their sources of income for their livelihood, through the technical, socio-economic and political upgradation of NRLM recipients is positive, this positive attitude might be leveraged for the diversification necessary for sustained growth. The public extension system, social and mutual learning, the institutionalized process of empowerment, and sustainable, equitable and participatory extension and development may all be effectively supported by the NRLM that positively affect the attitude and promote livelihood diversification. The most important thing in the stakeholders is a good and favourable attitude, self-confidence and ability for self-determination, in addition to efficient collaboration and coordination amongst them.

#### COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

#### REFERENCES

1. Pradhan S, Naberia S, Harikrishna YV, Jallalaph V. Livelihood security of small farmers in Jabalpur District of Madhya Pradesh. *Indian Journal of Extension Education*. 2020;56(4):98-102.
2. Bhoir RD, Kolgane BT, Gurav KV. Attitude of farmers towards different integrated farming system components. *Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry*. 2020;10(1):31-34.
3. Kabir MJ, Cramb R, Alauddin M, Roth C, Crimp S. Farmers' perceptions of and responses to environmental change in southwest coastal Bangladesh. *Asia Pacific Viewpoint*. 2017;58(3):362–378.
4. Goswami P, Rajan P, Jaiswal DK. Effectiveness of Deendayal Antyodaya Yojna- National Rural Livelihoods Mission on Empowerment of Women in Sagar District of Madhya Pradesh. *Indian Journal of Extension Education*. 2021;57(2):162-165.
5. Singh A, Rajan P, Naberia S, Singh V. Perception towards recommended nutrition garden practices among farm women. *The Pharma Innovation*. 2023;12(10):1089-1090.
6. Sarkar R, Rajan P, Bisht K, Singh SRK. Perception of tribal farmers toward training and services provided by Krishi Vigyan Kendra, Kanker (Chhattisgarh). *Indian Journal of Extension Education*. 2022; 57(3):73-77.
7. Srivani TNSS, Rajan P, Naberia S, Singh DK. Farmer's perception towards Pradhan Mantri Van Dhan Vikas Yojana in Andhra Pradesh. *Indian Journal of Extension Education*. 2022;58(1):165-169.
8. Rana KK, Rajan P, Singh SRK. Assessing Impact of KrishiVigyan Kendra on Employment Generation of Rural Youth. *International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences*. 2018;(Special Issue-6):2822-2826.
9. Rajan P, Khare N, Singh SRK, Khan MA. Constraints perceived by tribal farmers in adoption of recommended practices. *Indian Journal of Extension Education*. 2014;50(3):65-68.
10. Rajan P, Khare N, Singh SRK. Factors affecting the Income generation of tribal farmers in Madhya Pradesh State of India. *Journal of Community Mobilization and Sustainable Development*. 2015;10(2):147-151.
11. Nahatkar SB, Thomas M, Rajan P. Bridging Yield Gap in Soybean Production through Technology Demonstration: Potential Source for Increasing Farmers Income in Central India. *Soybean Research*. 2017;15(2):39-47.
12. Payasi S, Rajan P, Bisht K, Vani GK. Attitude of tribal farmers towards forest-based livelihood practices in Shahdol district of Madhya Pradesh. *The Pharma Innovation Journal*. 2023;12(10):1793-1797.
13. Rajan P, Khare N, Singh SRK. A Scale to measure attitude of farmers towards technological demonstration. *Journal of Community Mobilization and Sustainable Development*. 2020;15(2):377-380.

14. Chauhan JK, Meena BS, Meena HR, Bhakat C, Upadhyay AD, Lahiri B, Pal P, Tengli MB, Kumar S, Chandegara AK and Koreti K. Assessment of livelihood security and diversification of tribal dairy farmers in NEH Region of India. Indian Research Journal of Extension Education. 2022;22(3):0976-1071.
15. Reddy BSL, Nataraju MS, Lakshminarayan MT. A scale to measure the attitude of farmers towards livelihood diversification. International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences. 2020; 9(5):2215-2222.
16. Mitra PK, Habiba A. Sultana M. and Akanda MGR. Livelihood diversification pursued by rural women farmer: The case of Bangladesh. Journal of Agriculture, Food and Environment. 2021; 2(1):93-96.

© 2023 Rajpoot et al.; This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

*Peer-review history:*

*The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:*  
<https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/109934>