

Original Research Article

<https://doi.org/10.20546/ijcmas.2018.709.116>

## Measuring the Loan Availability, Utilization, Repayment and Its Effect on Income under Mahila Samridhi Yojana among Farm Women of Madhya Pradesh, India

Neha Sharma<sup>1\*</sup>, Sadhana Tomar<sup>2</sup>, Shashikant Chaturvedi<sup>3</sup> and D.V. Singh<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Jiwaji University, Gwalior, Madhya Pradesh, India

<sup>2</sup>VRG PG College, Morar, Gwalior, Madhya Pradesh, India

<sup>3</sup>KVK Lower Suansari, Arunachal Pradesh, India

<sup>4</sup>KVK, Tonk (Raj.), India

*\*Corresponding author*

### ABSTRACT

Women play pivotal role in rural development in developing countries, among the poor, rural women are the poorest and more venerable. Empirical evidences suggest that women in rural areas are more adversely affect by poverty than men. Hence, there is need for economic upliftment of the farm women through enhancing their income and reducing the drudgery for maintaining their health condition. This study was conducted in Gwalior district, comprises of 4 blocks namely- Morar, Ghatigaon, Dabra, Bhitwar. Three Villages of each block were selected purposively. Total twelve villages were selected for collection of primary data under study. Twenty five rural women of each village were selected randomly for the study. Thus, total 300 rural women were selected for the purpose. Results showed that majority of the respondents and received loan under MSY from Nationalized Banks. Majority of the respondents (70.33 percent) had received lesser then the amount they had applied for. VLW/Gram Sevak was the most important sources of awareness for getting information regarding programme of the respondents followed by Panchayat Members, Radio, Television and Patwari etc. It was found that all the respondents investigated do not possess complete knowledge and information about the programme. It was observed that majority (75.67 percent) of the respondents stated that they had not produced any co-lateral security for obtaining the loan. Hundred percent of the respondents had stated that no other members of the family have received MSY loan. The study reveals that 'diversion of the amount for other work' and 'no returns' from their income resulted in feeling of chances of waiver of loans which acted as a hindrance in repayment of loan in time. Hence this study reflects the visible and significant economic change as the impact of the Mahila Samridhi Yojana.

#### Keywords

Farm women, Loan availability, Mahila Samridhi Yojana, Repayment

#### Article Info

##### Accepted:

08 August 2018

##### Available Online:

10 September 2018

### Introduction

Women play pivotal role in rural development in developing countries, among the poor, rural women are the poorest and more venerable.

Empirical evidences suggest that women in rural areas are more adversely affect by poverty than men. The largest numbers of women in India are engaged in farming operations either as cultivators or as

supervisors or as agricultural labourers. The contribution of female labour is towards agricultural production is always more than the male labour in all types of landholding size. The development of village is a precondition for balanced economic development accelerating economic growth and industrial advancement the basic requirements for economic growth, i.e. savings and investment market for industrial products ultimately depends upon the rural development. It is an all pervasive, multi-dimensional, multi-disciplinary and comprehensive approach to development. It means achieving the goal of enrichment of the overall quality life covering all its aspects economic, social, cultural etc. Development of rural women can gear the rapid socio-economic in development process in the rural areas since rural women have capacity to orient themselves to go along the main stream superstitions, disorder and misconceptions prevalent in the Indian social system. Therefore, the development of people and the nation always depends on the health, creativeness, potentialities, participation, attitude, role and status of women in a society. The status of rural women is improving day by day. With the objective of providing economics security to the rural women and to encourage, the saving habit among them. The limit of microcredit to each member of the group is Rs. 25,000/- and the rate of interest to be paid by the women beneficiaries has been reduced to 4%. During the training, the group formed into a self-help group (SHG). The scheme has been made broad based to cover all the trades and activities practiced by women. Under this plan, the rural women of 18 years of above age can open their saving account in the rural post office of their own area with a minimum Rs. 4 or its multiplier. Such accounts opened under the scheme account are provided 25% bonus with a maximum of Rs. 300 every year. Under this programme, the Central Social Welfare Board

gives financial assistance to voluntary organizations for undertaking a wide variety of income generating activities which include the production of central components in ancillaries units, handlooms, handicrafts, agro-based activities such as animal husbandry sericulture and fisheries and self-employment ventures like vegetables or fish-vending, etc. Some other researchers also studied on the similar schemes and observed significant findings for making way out to this study viz., Chavai (2003), Baghel *et al.*, (2004), Badodiya *et al.*, (2008), Badodiya *et al.*, (2011), Meshram *et al.*, (2005), Meshram *et al.*, (2006), Meshram *et al.*, (2007). There was an urgent need for drastic simplification of the operational rules for MSY accounts and reducing the operational costs to ensure sustainability of the scheme. There was also need to strengthen the monitoring mechanism for the scheme.

## **Materials and Methods**

For the purpose of this study the entire field of methodology has been divided into five parts- 1.Selection and nature of the universe, 2.Selection of the respondents, 3.Tools and techniques of data collection, 4.Interpretation and analysis of the data. 5. Hypotheses of the study. The study was conducted in Morar block of Gwalior district. The district comprises of 4 blocks namely- Morar, Ghatigaon, Dabra, Bhitarwar. Three Villages of each block were selected purposively. Total twelve villages were selected for collection of primary data under study. Twenty five rural women of each village were selected randomly for the study. Thus the total 300 rural women were selected for the purpose. The finances under MSY have been made for various activities by the banks for tabulation purpose they have been classified these activities under four broad heads (Sectors). They are: 1. Farming, 2. Small Industries, 3. Business (Small Business), 4. Services A

complete list of the villages under Mahila Samridhi Yojana (MSY) was obtained from District Rural Development Agency, PRIs, Line department and the financing agencies. For each selected village, a list of landless, marginal and small farming women villagers was prepared, and the beneficiaries were selected randomly by using sample random method. Information regarding the following Socio-personal and socio-economic traits of the beneficiaries-Socio personal traits-Independent Variables: Age, Education, Caste, Type of family, Size of family, Family background, Social participation, Occupation, Land Holding, Material Possession, Credit orientation, Material Possession, Attitude towards Govt. Scheme, Knowledge about MSY; Dependent variable-Annual income increased due to the programme were collected The collected data were tabulated and presented in the form of tables and figures as per necessity and to draw logical conclusions for the result (impact of the Mahila Samridhi Yojana) with the help of suitable statistical tools and an appropriate use of computer was made. Karl Pearson's Correlation coefficient (r) statistical techniques were used in the study.

## **Results and Discussion**

### **Source of loan**

The benefits available under Mahila Samridhi Yojana had started reaching people and were made available to the beneficiaries. Thus, all the beneficiaries who had received loan from different sources under MSY have been considered in this study and taken as respondents. This period of gap has been kept to visualize the reflection of the overall impact of the MSY loan on the beneficiaries and change there in Social and economic life.

The data show in table 1 indicates that 86.00 percent of the beneficiary respondents

received the loan from Nationalized Banks while 14.00 percent received the loan from central co-operative bank. Thus, we can conclude that majority of the respondents and received loan under MSY from Nationalized Banks.

### **Occupation to obtaining loan**

The data in the given table 2 indicates that out of the total beneficiary respondents in the Farming sector cent percent of them were in the same occupation prior to the receipt of loan. Similarly, it was the same in the case of respondents in the industry sector. Out of the total respondents in the services sector, 64.15 per cent of them were in the similar occupation prior to the receipt of loan, whereas out of the total respondents in the Business sector, 55.55 per cent were in the same occupation prior to obtaining the loan.

### **Sector wise loan applied and loan received**

It is evident from table 3 that the sector wise distribution of the respondents regarding the amount of loan applied and loan received. The data in the table indicates that out of the total respondents in the Farming sector, only 25.00 per cent had received the applied amount while 75.00 per cent had received fewer amounts. Similar trends were observed in sector-wise loan. This brings to the fact that loan applications were prepared with the demand for loan on the higher side. But after scrutiny by the bank officials lesser amount then applied were sanctioned based on the assessment of the capability of the beneficiaries to manage.

### **Co-lateral security produced for obtaining the loan**

Data in table 4 indicates the responses of the beneficiary respondents regarding the co-lateral security produced for obtaining the

loan. The data in the above table indicates that about 24.33 percent of the beneficiary respondents had produced co-lateral security for obtaining the loan while majority (75.67 percent) of the respondents stated that they had not produced any co-lateral security for obtaining the loan.

As per the MSY norm, no co-lateral security is required to be produced for obtaining the loan and as such those who have produced the security have done so of their own free will.

### **MSY loan obtained other member of the family**

The table 5 describes the status of the beneficiary respondents regarding the MSY loan obtained by other members of the family. From the data in the above table it is clear that cent percent of the respondents had stated that no other members of the family have received MSY loan.

### **Loan taken from other sources than the MSY**

Data in table 6 depicts the responses of the beneficiary respondents regarding the loan taken from other sources than the MSY. From the table it is clear that majority of the respondents (71.67 percent) had not taken any loan from any sources other than MSY while, 20.33 percent had stated loan / from co-operative society, 06.67 percent from money lenders and 01.33 percent from their relatives.

Thus, we can conclude that majority of the respondents had not taken any loan from sources other than that of MSY.

### **Utilization pattern of the loan**

The data present in table 7 describe about the responses of the beneficiaries regarding the utilization of loan. From the data presented in

the table, it is clear that majority of the beneficiary respondents (84.67 percent) had spent the amount for the purpose for which loan was taken while only 15.33 percent had spent some of the amount on some other purpose then that of the loan purpose which means that they had diverted some amount of loan for some other purpose not specified in the application for loan.

It is significant to note that majority of the beneficiary respondents were honest towards utilization of loan for the purpose for which they had received.

### **Terms and conditions of the loan**

The data show in table 8 indicates the responses of the beneficiary respondents regarding the terms and conditions of the loan.

The data states that only 42.00 percent of the beneficiary respondents were satisfied with the terms and conditions which had been put by the bank for giving the loan although 58.00 percent of the beneficiary respondents were 'Unsatisfied'

Thus, we find that majority of the respondents were not satisfied with the terms and conditions of the loan.

### **Form of the loan received**

Table 9 indicates the form in which the loan was received by the beneficiary respondents. While 83.00 percent of the respondents had received the loan in the form of cash, 08.00 percent reported that loan in the form of materials were received by them, 05.33 percent of the respondents reported that they had purchased the required materials themselves through the purchase committee while only 03.67 percent had received the loan in some other from then those mentioned above.

**Table.1** Distribution of the beneficiary respondents on the basis of the source of loan under MSY

S. N.	Name of the bank	Nos.	Percentage
1.	Cooperative & other Banks	42	14.00
2.	Nationalized Banks	258	86.00
<b>Total</b>		300	100.00

**Table.2** Distribution of the respondents on the basis of their occupation prior to obtaining the loan

S. N.	Occupation	Frequency	Total (N)
1.	Farming	78 (100.00)	78 (100.00)
2.	Industry	80 (100.00)	80 (100.00)
3.	Business	68 (64.15)	106 (100.00)
4.	Services	20 (55.55)	36 (100.00)

**Table.3** Sector wise distributions of the responses of the beneficiary respondents regarding the loan applied and loan received

Responses				
S. N.	Sectors	Received the applied amount	Received less amount	Total
1.	Farming	19 (25.00)	57 (75.00)	76 (100.00)
2.	Industry	22 (26.19)	62 (73.81)	84 (100.00)
3.	Business	34 (32.08)	72 (67.92)	106 (100.00)
4.	Services	14 (41.18)	20 (58.82)	34 (100.00)
<b>Total</b>		89	211	300
<b>Percentage</b>		29.67	70.33	100.00

**Table.4** Responses of the beneficiary respondents regarding the co-lateral security produced for obtaining the loan

S. N.	Particulars of security	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Produced security for the loan	73	24.33
2.	Did not provide any security for loan	227	75.67
<b>Total</b>		300	100.00

**Table.5** Description of the beneficiary respondents regarding the MSY loan obtained other member of the family

S. N.	Loan obtained by the other members of the family	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Loan received by other members	-	-
2.	Did not receive	300	100.00
<b>Total</b>		300	100.00

**Table.6** Description of the beneficiary respondents regarding the loan taken from other sources than the MSY

S. N.	Other sources	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Did not take any loan	215	71.67
2.	Banks / Co-operative society	61	20.33
3.	Money lender	20	06.67
4.	Relatives	04	01.33
5.	Others	-	-
<b>Total</b>		300	100.00

**Table.7** Responses of the beneficiary respondents regarding the utilization of the loan

S. N.	Utilization of the loan	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Spent for the purpose for which Loan was taken	254	84.67
2.	Spent some amount on other than loan purpose	46	15.33
<b>Total</b>		300	100.00

**Table.8** Responses of the beneficiary respondents regarding the terms and conditions of the loan

S. N.	Particulars	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Satisfied	126	42.00
2.	Un-satisfied	174	58.00
<b>Total</b>		300.00	100.00

**Table.9** Responses of the beneficiary respondents regarding the form of the loan received

S. N.	Form of the loan	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Received in cash	249	83.00
2.	Materials were given	24	08.00
3.	Purchased by the beneficiaries through the purchase committee	16	05.33
4.	Others	11	03.67
<b>Total</b>		300	100.00

**Table.10** Responses of the beneficiary respondents regarding the working days wasted in the process of obtaining the loan

S. N.	Number of days	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Up to 7days	26	08.67
2.	8 to 15 days	205	68.33
3.	15 to 30 days	56	18.67
4.	More than 30days	13	04.33
<b>Total</b>		300	100.00

**Table.11** Responses of the beneficiary respondents regarding the money Spent for obtaining the loan

S. N.	Money spent	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Up to Rs. 500	150	50.00
2.	Rs. 501 to 800	150	50.00
3.	Rs.801 to 1000	-	-
4.	Rs.1001 and above	-	-
<b>Total</b>		300	100.00

**Table.12** Responses of the beneficiary respondents regarding the time taken for sanction of loan

S. N.	Time taken	Frequency	Percentage
1.	1Month	19	06.33
2.	1 to 3 Months	256	85.33
3.	3 to 6 Months	20	06.67
4	Above 6 months	05	01.67
<b>Total</b>		300	100.00

**Table.13** Responses of the beneficiary respondents regarding the time taken between sanction of loan and disbursement of loan

S. N.	Time span	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Within 15 Days	55	18.33
2.	16 To 30 Days	243	81.00
3.	1to 3 Months	02	00.67
4.	More than 3 Months	-	-
<b>Total</b>		300	100.00

**Table.14** Responses of the beneficiary respondents regarding their effect on income

S. N.	Sectors	Effect on income			Total
		Increased	Decreased	No change	
1.	Farming	74 (94.94.87)	-	04 (05.13)	78
2.	Industry	77 (96.25)	-	03 (03.75)	80
3.	Business	102 (96.23)	-	04 (03.77)	106
4.	Services	34 (94.44)	-	02 (05.57)	36
<b>Total</b>		287 (95.67)	-	13 (04.33)	300

**Table.15** Responses of the beneficiary respondents regarding the benefit of the loan

S. N.	Sectors	Responses		Total
		Benefitted	Did not Benefit	
1.	Farming	74 (94.87)	04 (05.13)	78
2.	Industry	77 (96.25)	03 (03.75)	80
3.	Business	102 (96.23)	04 (03.77)	106
4.	Services	34 (94.44)	02 (05.56)	36
<b>Total</b>		287 (95.67)	13 (04.33)	300

**Table.16** Responses of the beneficiary respondents regarding the quantum of loan

S. N.	Sectors	Quantum of loan		
		Sufficient	Must be increased	Total
1.	Farming	10 (13.16)	66 (86.84)	76
2.	Industry	12 (14.29)	72 (85.71)	84
3.	Business	36 (33.96)	70 (66.04)	106
4.	Services	08 (23.53)	26 (76.47)	34
<b>Total</b>		66 (22.00)	234 (78.00)	300
<b>Percentage</b>		22.00	78.00	100.00

**Table.17** Responses of the beneficiary respondents (sector wise) regarding the savings made due to the MSY benefits

S. N.	Sectors	Total No. of respondents	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Farming	76	66	84.62
2.	Industry	84	74	88.09
3.	Business	106	85	80.18
4.	Services	34	29	85.29
<b>Total</b>		300	254	84.67

**Table.18** Responses of the beneficiary respondents (sector-wise) regarding the Form of savings made

S. N.	Sectors	Total respondents	Form of Deposits			
			Deposits in Bank	Give loan	Gold Silver	Total
1.	Farming	76	58 (87.88)	02 (03.03)	06 (09.09)	66
2.	Industry	84	68 (91.90)	03 (04.05)	03 (04.05)	74
3.	Business	106	76 (89.41)	4 (04.70)	05 (05.89)	85
4.	Services	34	27 (93.10)	-	02 (06.90)	29
<b>Total</b>		300	229	10	16	254
<b>Percentage</b>			90.16	03.94	06.30	100.00

**Table.19** Responses of the beneficiary respondents regarding the fulfillment of the needs due to the MSY programme

S. N.	Fulfillment of the needs of	Nos. (N=300)	Percentage
1.	Food	254	100.00
2.	Clothing	254	100.00
3.	Education	254	100.00
4.	Medical treatment	254	100.00

**Table.20** Description of the beneficiary respondents regarding their Repayment on the basis of enterprise

S. N.	Sector / Enterprise	Complete	Repayment Partial	Complete overdue	Total
1.	Farming	66 (86.84)	4 (05.26)	6 (07.90)	76
2.	Industry	74 (88.09)	6 (07.15)	4 (04.76)	84
3.	Business	85 (80.19)	13 (12.26)	8 (07.55)	106
4.	Services	29 (85.30)	2 (05.88)	3 (08.82)	34
<b>Total</b>		254	25	21	300
<b>Percentage</b>		84.67	08.33	07.00	100.00

**Table.21** Responses of the beneficiary respondents regarding the reasons for repayment in time

S. N.	Reasons	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Hard labor	254	84.67
2.	Good income	254	84.67
3.	Feeling to get out of debt	254	84.67

**Table.22** Responses of the beneficiary respondents regarding reasons for Non-repayment of loan in time

S. N.	Reasons	Frequency (N=46)	Parentage
1.	No returns	46	100.00
2.	Spent on other work	20	43.47
3.	Chances of waiver	46	100.00
4.	Paid old debts	10	21.73

Thus, if we critically analyses the above data we find that majority of the respondents had received the loan in the form of materials or purchased themselves through the purchase committee which means that loan in the form of cash was discouraged.

**Working days wasted in the process of obtaining the loan**

The data presents in table 10 depicts the responses of the beneficiary respondents regarding their working days wasted during

the process of obtaining the loan. From the above data it is clear that 08.67 percent of the respondents had to spend 7 days in the process of obtaining the loan while a majority of 68.33 percent had to spend about 8 to 15 days for obtaining the loan. In the opinion of the respondents they had to spend these days to attend the officials and get the required formalities completed.

If they were not required to devote these working days for getting the loan sanctioned and disbursed, they could have used it for some other useful productive purposes.

### **Money spent for obtaining the loan**

The above table depicts the responses of the beneficiary respondents regarding the money spent for the purpose of obtaining the loan. The data in the above table shows that 50.00 percent of the respondents had spent upto Rs. 500/- for obtaining the loan while the same percentage of the respondents had spent Rs. 501 to Rs.800/-for obtaining the loan.

Thus, we find that sent percent of the respondents had spent money ranging upto 500/ - for obtaining the loan.

### **Time taken for sanction of loan**

Responses of the beneficiary respondents regarding the time taken for sanction of loan has been described in the above table 12. Table 12 reveals that 85.33 percent of the respondents reported that it took 'one to three 'month in sanctioning of their loan while 06.67 percent reported that it took 'three to six ' month in sanctioning of their loan.

Only 01.67 percent had stated that it took more than' six months' Thus, we can conclude that a notable majority of the respondents got their loan sanctioned within 'one to three months'.

### **Time taken between sanction of loan and disbursement of loan**

Responses of the beneficiary respondents regarding the time taken between sanction of loan and disbursement of loan has been depicted in the table 13. The data indicates that 18.33 percent of the respondents the time taken between sanction of loan and its disbursement was within 15days 'while a significant majority (81.00) of the respondents reported the time taken to be 16 to 30 days' only 00.67 percent of the respondents had stated that it took '1 to 3 months time' between sanction and disbursement of loan. Thus, for majority of the respondents it was upto 30 days time taken between sanction and disbursement of loan.

### **Effect of loans on income**

The responses of the beneficiary respondents regarding the effect of MSY loan on their income have been depicted in table 14.

It is evidently clear that out of the total respondents under Farming sector, 94.87 percent of them had reported an increase in their income while 05.13 percent had stated no change. Under the industry sector, 96.25 percent of the respondents had reported increase in their income while 03.75 percent had stated no changes. Under the business sector, 96.23 percent of the respondents had stated an increase in their income while 03.77 percent stated no change. Under the Services sector, 94.44 percent of the respondents had reported increase in their income while only 05.57percent had stated no change.

Badodiya *et al.*, (2008) supported similar findings in SGSY. Thus we can conclude that in all the above four sectors majority of the respondents had admitted increase in their income due to the effect of MSY.

### **Benefits of the loan**

Data in table 15 indicates the responses of the beneficiary respondents regarding the benefit of the loan received under MSY. From the data, it is clear that out of the total respondents under Farming sector, 94.74 percent had benefitted from the MSY loan while 05.26 percent had stated that they did not benefit. Under the industry sector, 96.87 percent of the respondents had stated to benefit from the MSY loan while 03.13 percent had stated that they did not benefit.

Under the Business sector, 96.25 percent of the respondents reported to be benefitted while only 03.75 percent did not benefit. And, under Services sector 94.44 percent of the respondents had benefitted from the MSY loan while only 05.56 percent had stated that they did not benefit. Thus, we find that in all the above four sector majority of the respondents had admitted to benefit from the MSY loan received by them.

### **Quantum of loan**

Responses of the beneficiary respondents regarding the quantum of loan provided them have been described in the table 16.

From the data in the above table, it is clear that out of the total respondents under Farming Sector, 13.16 percent of them stated that the quantum was sufficient while 86.84 percent stated that it must be increased. Under the Industry sector, 14.29 percent felt sufficient while 85.71 percent of the respondents stated that it must be increased. Under the Business sector, 33.96 percent of the respondents felt the quantum of loan as sufficient while 66.304 percent stated that it must be increased. Under the Services sector, 23.53 percent of the respondents felt sufficient while 76.47 percent stated that it must be increased.

### **Savings made due to the MSY benefits**

Responses of the beneficiary respondents regarding the savings made due to the MSY benefits has been presented in the table 17. From the data it is clear that under the Farming sector 84.62 percent of the respondents had made saving while under Industry, Business and Services sector 88.09 percent, 80.18 percent and 85.29 percent had made saving due to the benefits from MSY loan respectively.

Thus, we found that the respondents under Industry Business sector had made the maximum saving while the respondents under Farming sector were the lowest amongst the above four sectors in respect of saving. This finding having similarity with Badodiya (2011) during MNREGA evaluation.

### **Form of savings made**

Responses of the beneficiary respondents (sector-wise) regarding the form of savings made due to the benefits from MSY loan has been presented in the given table 18. Out of 66 beneficiary respondents under the Farming sector regarding the form of savings made due to the benefits from MSY loan The data above indicates that under the Farming sector, 87.88 percent of the respondents deposited their savings in bank while 03.03 percent had given on loan and 09.09 percent had purchased gold-silver. Under the Industry sector, 91.90 percent of the respondents deposited in the bank while 04.05 percent each had given as loan and purchased gold-silver. Under the Business sector, 89.41 percent of the respondents deposited in the bank while 04.70 percent had given as loan and 05.89 percent had purchased gold- silver. Out of the total respondents under Services sector 93.10 percent deposited their savings in bank while 06.90 percent had purchased gold and silver.

Thus, it is quite significant to note that a large majority of the respondents under the above four sectors had deposited their savings in bank which is a trend and a sign of development in the rural sector.

### **Need fulfillment due to MSY programme**

Responses of the beneficiary respondents regarding the fulfillment of the needs due to the MSY has been depicted in the table 19. It is clearly indicates that majority (83.68) of the respondents had admitted that due to the MSY programme their needs fulfillment with respect to food, clothing, education and medical treatment has increased. Thus, it is clear that MSY programme has increased the fulfillment of food, clothing, causation and medical treatment of the beneficiary respondents.

### **Repayment on the basis of enterprise**

Data in table 20 depicts the status of the respondents regarding their repayment on the basis of the enterprise. It is clear that under the farming sector, 86.84 percent of the beneficiary respondents had made complete repayment, while 05.26 percent had partially repaid. Only 07.90 percent had overdue. Under the industry sector, 88.09 percent had made complete repayment while 07.15 percent had made partial repayment. Only 04.76 percent had their repayment overdue. Under the business sector, 80.19 percent had made complete repayment while 05.88 percent had partially repaid. Only 08.82 percent had overdue. Similarly, under services sector, 85.30 percent had made complete repayment while 14.29 percent had made partial repayment.

Thus, we found that in all the above four sector quite a significant majority which is a positive signal towards healthy economic development.

### **Reasons for repayment in time**

Responses of the beneficiary respondents regarding the reasons for repayment in time has been depicted in the table 21. The data in the table 21 indicates that out of the total respondents who had made complete repayment in time, cent percent of them were of the opinion that 'Hard labour' 'Good income' and feeling to get out of debt' were the reasons for making the repayment in time.

### **Reasons for non-repayment of loan in time**

Responses of the beneficiary respondents regarding reasons for non-repayment of loan in time have been depicted in the table 22. Data says that 'No returns' and Chances of waiver 'were the main reasons supported by cent percent of the respondents for non-repayment of loan in time. Only 43.47 percent and 21.73 percent had reported that they had 'Spent on other work' and paid old debts' respectively. Thus, we find that 'diversion of the amount for other work' and 'no returns' from their income resulted in feeling of chances of waiver of loans which acted as a hindrance in repayment of loan in time.

On the basis of the above-said discussion it could be concluded that *Mahila Samridhi Yojana* has visible role in loan aviability, disbursement and its utilization by the beneficiary women. Besides it helped in timely repayment as well as enhancing the income of the beneficiary women due to better management and scheme implementation. It helped the farm women to initiate a new venture in their situation so that their economic condition could be enhanced.

### **References**

Badodiya, S.K., R.S. Kushwah, S.K. Garg and S.K. Shakya (2011). Impact of Mahatma Gandhi National Rural

- Employment Guarantee Act (MNREGA) on Poverty Alleviation. *Rajasthan J. Extn. Edu.* 19: 206-209
- Badodiya, S.K., Shakya, S.K. and Daipuria O.P. (2008). A Study on Swarnajayanti Gram Swarozgar Yojana with reference to Increase in Annual Income of Swarozgaries. *Bharatiya Krishi Anusandhan Patrika* vol. 3-4 Pp. 184-189.
- Baghel, S.P.K.S; Agrawal, S.V and Pandey, A.K (2004). Impact of Minor Irrigation Activity under SGSY on Adoption of Improved Agricultural Production Practices among Tribal Farmers. *Madhya Journal of Extension Education* Volume-7. Pp. 21-24.
- Chavai, A.M. and Nirban, A.J. (2003). Success of TRYESM in generating self-employment. *Maharashtra J. Ext. Edu.* Vol. XXI (2) page no. 162-166.
- Meshram, V., Pyasi, V.K., Agrawal, S.K. and Chobitkar, N. (2006). Impact of SGSY in relation to Income and Employment Generation of Beneficiaries. *Madhya Journal of Extension Education* Volume-7. Pp. 34-36.
- Meshram, Vishal; Pyasi, V.K. and Saxena, K.K. (2005). Impact of Swarnajayanti Gram Swarozgar Yojana on Beneficiaries of Mandla District of M.P. *Indian Research Journal of Extension Education.* 5 (2 & 3): 148-149.
- Meshram, V; Pyasi, V, K; Srivastav, A; Chobitkar, N and S.Rawat (2007). Impact of SGSY Programme in Increasing Income and Employment amongst the Beneficiaries. 4<sup>th</sup> National Extension Education Congress. Organized by society of Extn. Edu., Agra and JNKVV, Jabalpur Pp. 127-128.

**How to cite this article:**

Neha Sharma, Sadhana Tomar, Shashikant Chaturvedi and Singh, D.V. 2018. Measuring the Loan Availability, Utilization, Repayment and Its Effect on Income under *Mahila Samridhi Yojana* among Farm Women of Madhya Pradesh, India. *Int.J.Curr.Microbiol.App.Sci.* 7(09): 962-974. doi: <https://doi.org/10.20546/ijcmas.2018.709.116>