

## SOCIO-ECONOMIC IMPACT OF TRYSEM AS PERCEIVED BY THE BENEFICIARIES

Ram Pal Singh<sup>1</sup>, Triveni Dutt<sup>2</sup> & D. Uma Maheswara Rao<sup>3</sup>

TRYSEM, Training of Rural Youth for Self Employment, an integrated component of IRDP, aims to develop entrepreneurs in the rural areas so that they can stand on their own feet and take strides on the path of economic growth and development. This programme was started in 1979 and trains rural youth (between 18 to 35 years of age) for self employment in the field of agriculture and allied activities, industries, service and business. Beneficiaries included youth living below poverty line, and belonging to categories of small and marginal farmers, agricultural labourers and rural artisans.

The effectiveness of such an innovative programme of rural development can only be seen through its impact on the life of the rural youth. Hence a study was conducted with the objective of assessing the socio-economic impact of TRYSEM on the beneficiaries, the rural youth.

### METHODOLOGY

This study was conducted in Lakhaoti and Buland Shahr blocks of Buland Shahr district of Uttar Pradesh. About 250 trained

beneficiaries of TRYSEM between the years 1989 and 1993 were randomly selected for the study. An attempt has been made to delineate the various impact indicators of TRYSEM on the beneficiaries. They were employment generation for self ones family members and other villagers, improvement in skill and knowledge, improvement in agriculture and animal husbandry, improvement in income and in socio-economic status. In addition, absorption of self in job sector was also seen as one of the impact indicators.

### RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

For the purpose of assessing the impact of TRYSEM on the beneficiaries, the respondent's perception on the identified impact indicators was measured on a three-point continuum, viz., 'satisfactory', 'optimistic' and 'unsatisfactory'. The results thus obtained are presented in Table 1.

As can be seen from the data in the table, six impact indicators were presented and the beneficiaries' response was recorded as satisfactory or optimistic or unsatisfactory.

Table 1. Perceived impact of beneficiaries on the impact indicators of TRYSEM

Impact Indicators	Satisfactory		Optimistic		Unsatisfactory	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
1. Improvement in skill	110	44	74	30	66	26
2. Improvement in knowledge	180	72	36	14.4	34	13.6
3. Improvement in agriculture and animal husbandry	137	55	90	36	23	9
4. Improvement in income	104	41.6	106	42.4	40	16
5. Improvement in socio-economic status	117	47	110	44	23	9
6. Absorption in jobs	65	26	80	32	105	42

1. Milk Procurement Manager, Gopal Milk Foods, New Delhi.
2. Reader, Ag. Ext., A.S. (P.G.) College, Lakhaoti, Buland Shahr.
3. Sr. Scientist, Division of Agricultural Extension, IARI, New Delhi-12.



The response 'unsatisfactory' may be showing a negative impact but the responses 'satisfactory' and 'optimistic' together show a positive picture of the impact of TRYSEM on beneficiaries.

**Improvement in Skill**—About 44 per cent of the trainees were satisfied with the impact indicator of improvement in skill. Since TRYSEM was meant to impact vocational skills among the rural youth, there is definitely a positive impact on them as far as skill improvement is concerned. In addition, about 30 per cent of them were optimistic about their skill improvement over a period of time through practice.

**Improvement in Knowledge**—About 72 per cent of trainees were quite satisfied with the impact indicator of improvement in knowledge. Through TRYSEM, they were exposed to new knowledge of a vocation and about 14.4 per cent were also optimistic about their knowledge improvement. Thus about 86 per cent of the trainees were positive about the improvement of knowledge through TRYSEM.

**Improvement in Agriculture and Animal Husbandry**—About 55 per cent of trainees under TRYSEM were quite satisfied that TRYSEM had impacted their farms and homes. Through training under TRYSEM, most of the beneficiaries got enough exposure to entrepreneurial skills that they began to apply them to their traditional enterprises of farming and animal husbandry. About 36 per cent were also optimistic that the TRYSEM would impact positively their farms and homes.

**Improvement in Income**—About 41.6 per cent of trainees, opined that TRYSEM scheme was working satisfactorily with regard to improvement in income of the family. According to them, the programme was well planned and well executed and was actually resulting in improvements in trainee's income.

Another 42.4 per cent of respondents were optimistic that their income would rise soon due to their participation in TRYSEM scheme.

**Improvement in Socio-economic Status**—About 47 per cent of trainees under

TRYSEM perceived that there was a positive and satisfactory impact on the overall socio-economic improvement of rural youth and their families through TRYSEM scheme. About 44 per cent were found to be optimistic about such an impact in near future.

**Absorption in Jobs**—This was another positive impact that has resulted due to training under TRYSEM. The beneficiaries who were able to acquire enough knowledge and adequate skills achieved good placements, usually in jobs with NGOs. About 26 per cent were quite satisfied while another 32 per cent were optimistic about their absorption in the job sector sooner or later.

**Employment Generated Through TRYSEM**—In the area of study, the data related to the extent of employment generated through TRYSEM scheme was collected in terms of whether the respondent had been able to start his or her own production unit or not. If he/she had started their own production, the next question was whether it created employment opportunities for others or not, etc. The data thus collected were analysed and presented in Table 2.

**Table 2. Details of success in starting enterprises, employment generation and employment seeking**

Details of Success	Frequency	(%)
Not got employment in any enterprise	60	24
Not able to start unit	85	34
Started own enterprise	105	42
Generated employment for others in own unit	70*	28*

\*These figures form part of 'started an enterprise'

The data, as can be seen from Table 2, revealed that 42 per cent respondents of the total sample had started their own production. Along with this 28 per cent also created employment for others. Among these others, the members of owner's family were not included. Only those persons were counted which had got employment in the production unit and which did not belong to the family of the owner. In some of the cases, it was also



observed that the family jointly had started the unit and all the family members worked in the unit. They did not employ any other persons. According to them (owners of such units) it saved money to be spent on wages of the labourers and all the family members were engaged in the production work. Along with this, when all the family members were engaged in own production unit, it increased the co-ordination in work, resulting in more output. They can work more as the working hours were according to their convenience and they were assigned the work according to their capabilities.

Among the total sample, there were 34 per cent respondents who were not able to start their own unit after completing their training. According to them, the training, which was given to them, was not self-explanatory and it did not provide the complete entrepreneurial skill to start their own unit. Along with this, all the micro level planning of the programme was done by the officers at central places, which did not completely cater to the needs of the respondents.

Chandakavate (1985) also reported similar findings. He reported that the programme had not made a major impact upon the poverty and living conditions of the beneficiaries in Sindigo Taluka of Bijapur district, Karnataka. Only 12 per cent of the families surveyed had been able to cross the poverty line and 36 per cent had benefited marginally. Nearly 20 per cent of the surveyed families had sold their assets. A major deficiency in the programme is that it is not based on decentralized micro level planning.

In the whole sample 24 per cent respondents did not get employment in any established unit. These were the respondents who, due to several reasons, were not able to start their

own production unit. They reported that they joined the training programme only with the hope of getting employment after successfully completing their training. But they had not got any employment. The reason for this might be that, as reported earlier, the contacts between training institutes and organizations in which the trained youth could be absorbed were very poor. A gainful self-employment requires entrepreneurial orientation with necessary knowledge and skill of modern technology and managerial skill. But the type of training and knowledge being given through the TRYSEM was not commensurate with the employment requirements of the industry.

According to Anuradha and Sinha (1985), the uniqueness of TRYSEM programme does not seem to have attracted attention of authority of training institutions. The attitude of some of the institutes was not favourable towards their trainees. They have not made any efforts to channelize the services of the expert trainers and to provide training in all aspects of entrepreneurship to the candidates in order to make them self-employed. There has been no co-ordination between the TRYSEM implementation agencies (DRDA and CD blocks) and the training institutions.

## CONCLUSION

Thus it can be concluded that the TRYSEM had impacted the lives of the beneficiaries in enriching their knowledge and skills and in making improvements in farming and animal husbandry. This had in turn had resulted in improvements in their incomes and in enhancing their socio-economic status. TRYSEM had also impacted employment generation in the villages as about 40 percent TRYSEM beneficiaries had started their own enterprises and provided employment to their own family members as well as other fellow villagers.

## REFERENCES

1. Anuradha, G. and Sinha, B. P. (1985) Management of TRYSEM programme: A Critical Analysis. Indian Journal of Extension Education, Vol. XXI No. 1&2 pp. 38-43
2. Chandakavate, M. S. (1985) Tardy Implementation of IRDP. Yojana.