

A Study on Impacts of Public Distribution System in Welfare of Agriculture Communities

Dr.R. Radhamani*

*Associate Professor & Head
NIFT-TEA College of Knitwear and Fashion, Tirupur*

Mr.S. Elango**

Research Scholar, K M College of Arts and Science, Muthur

ABSTRACT: *The major scheme for food subsidies in India is called the Public Distribution System (PDS). It offers food grains at discounted prices and reaches out to roughly 11 crore families. PDS derives from the British "rationing" system used from 1939 to 1945, and it was kept in place as a crucial element of social policy during the process of planned economic development that began in 1951. The agricultural industry dominates the state's economy in Tamil Nadu. Since agriculture is one of the main sources of income in Tamil Nadu, almost 70% of the state's population is engaged in farming. In total, Tamil Nadu has occupied 1.3 lakh square kilo meters, or 63 L.Ha, for plantations The research population consists of agriculture and allied employee families in western region of TamilNadu. The purpose of the current study is to investigate the problems raised by the objectives and hypotheses regarding the applications and efficiency of fair price shops under public distribution System and its impacts towards agriculture families. The study is based on a survey-based empirical research design. Primary and secondary data were both gathered for the study. The primary information was gathered via a survey method that involved direct personal interviews with ration card participants*

KEY WORD: *Agriculture Community; Public Distribution system; Fair Price Shops, Agricultural Prices Commission*

Date of Submission: 08-08-2023

Date of Acceptance: 23-08-2023

I. Introduction:

The major scheme for food subsidies in India is called the Public Distribution System (PDS). It offers food grains at discounted prices and reaches out to roughly 11 crore families. PDS derives from the British "rationing" system used from 1939 to 1945, and it was kept in place as a crucial element of social policy during the process of planned economic development that began in 1951. The policy for growth with justice was built upon it. The scheme was expanded during the First Five-Year Plan (1951–1956) to include all rural areas that experienced ongoing food shortages. The Agricultural Prices Commission (APC) and the Food Corporation of India (FCI) were established in 1965. PDS was maintained over time as a purposeful social strategy to offer food staples and other necessities to poor groups in society at reduced costs. The PDS offered food subsidies to all beneficiaries without discrimination up until 1997.

To focus its coverage on a select group of recipients, the Indian government modified the nearly universal PDS and introduced the Targeted Public Distribution System (TPDS) in 1997. The objective was to give food grains to a population that was under the poverty level (BPL). The Ministry of Rural Development of the Government of India conducted a BPL census in order to identify BPL families. When compared to those over the poverty line (APL), food 2 grains were sold to this group for half the price of the economic cost.

For BPL families, a specific amount of rice and wheat/atta were provided each month, but there was no such fixed amount for APL families. With time, BPL families received more benefits. An additional food security programme called the Antyodaya Anna Yojna was introduced in 2000 to help the most impoverished members of society (AAY). An order from the Supreme Court led to the development of a list of five criteria to identify these households. The allowance was set at 35 kilo grammes per month for each AAY-covered family. To extend coverage, the programme was expanded twice, in 2003 and 2004.

Keywords ; Public Distribution System (PDS), Antyodaya Anna Yojna (AAY), Bellow Poverty Line (BPL)

AGRICULTURE FARMING IN TAMILNADU

The agricultural industry dominates the state's economy in Tamil Nadu. Since agriculture is one of the main sources of income in Tamil Nadu, almost 70% of the state's population is engaged in farming. In total, Tamil Nadu has occupied 1.3 lakh square kilo meters, or 63 L.Ha, for plantations. With the assistance of so many effective farmers who are both responsive and receptive to the technological advancement provided in Tamil Nadu's agricultural sector, the agriculture in that state has performed admirably throughout the years. To assure growth in the state's agriculture, the agricultural department of Tamil Nadu has resolved to adopt a variety of development plans and create cutting-edge technology. The Tamil Nadu Agricultural Department has launched a number of initiatives to increase agricultural output and enhance the financial standing of the farming industry. For the people of Tamil Nadu, agriculture has always been their primary and traditional occupation. In Tamil Nadu, farmers make up about 56% of the population. Food and feed are provided by the agricultural sector to humans and cattle, respectively. For many sectors, it serves as the supplier of raw materials.

Many facets of agriculture have seen consistent growth since independence. With the state's Five-Year Plans properly implemented, irrigation facilities were enhanced. Production was greatly increased by the green revolution's use of chemical fertilizers and hybrid cultivars. The new reforms that were implemented after independence included the abolition of the Zamindari system, land tenuring, farm consolidation, the enactment of the land ceiling act, and cooperative farming. Globalization recently had a positive impact on Tamil Nadu's agricultural output and farmers income.

AGRICULTURE COMMODITIES AND PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM

The central government is responsible for making the food grains required for the PDS available through the Food Corporation of India and for providing a subsidy to make it affordable. Since beneficiaries buy discounted PDS items through the FPS, fair pricing shops (FPSs) operating under the PDS are nodal locations of enormous importance. The PDS Control Order 2001 (GOI 2001), issued by the Department of Food and Public Distribution, Government of India, elaborately discusses the procedure for licensing FPSs and monitoring compliance through vigilance committees and other government personnel.

The FCI buys food grains at the minimum support price (MSP) from farmers and distributes them to all states at the same central issue price (CIP). The CIP is less expensive than the financial outlay made by the federal government to buy food grain. Payment to growers, expenses for handling, storing, and distributing the grain, as well as the cost of maintaining the required buffer stock, are the key elements of economic cost. The food subsidy paid by the central government from its yearly non-Plan budget accounts for the difference between the economic cost and the CIP. Consumer end prices (CEPs) are set by the states at the FPS level, with a maximum increase over the central issue price of Re. 0.50 per kg (CIP), especially for those who live below the poverty level. The governments are also able to expand the BPL category's scope and cover the subsidy with their own funds.

AGRICULTURE COMMUNITIES AND PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM

In Tamil Nadu, the local economy is mostly based on agriculture and allied industries. 93 percent of farmers in the state still operate tiny or marginal farms, providing a living for more than two-thirds of rural households. The welfare and well-being of the state's citizens are impacted, either directly or indirectly, by the public distribution system's performance. In order to address the needs of the farming community, the State Government's principal duty is to provide price stability for agricultural products through fair pricing channels. In addition to helping an agriculture communities become self-sufficient in foodgrains, public distribution system development is crucial for assuring household food security, promoting justice in the distribution of income and wealth, and ultimately lowering the poverty rate. In fact, unless agriculture communities' life standard is revived, significant economic development would mean nothing to the vast majority of people living in rural regions.

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Babu, S., Singh, J., (2019), The researcher examined the investment, income, and expenditure patterns of the small and marginal farmers in Karnataka and Punjab. From the research, it has been observed that farmers in Punjab made a higher investment in the farm, dairy, and household items than that of Karnataka. It was detected that in Punjab, Expenditure on crop and dairy enterprises was more than in Karnataka. In Punjab, there is a need to increase farm inputs that will automatically increase farm profitability. Whereas in Karnataka, off-farm employment opportunities should be improved.

Emmanuel, B., (2015), This research study found that age, education level, household member size, experience related to the farming business, income generated through farming business, off-farm income, and loan obtained as impacted directly on farmer's capacity to save and invest in the study area. Many small and marginal farmers have to lack knowledge about investments and schemes of the government and other financial institutions. The study has suggested that government should take some necessary actions to implement some programs for the better communication of the investment schemes to the farmers regarding the importance of savings and

investment. Various programs should be initiated by the government such as advanced technology, farm services, and medium- or long-term loans, etc. Co-operative societies should be established for small-scale farmers in the research area.

Pandey G.N., (2011), In the Ph.D. research thesis he suggested that to increase farm investments and income various programs related to irrigation schemes, subsidized schemes for farming, credit facilities have to be provided. Farmers are not aware of credit facilities and the study was a majority on Economic aspects rather than financial aspects.

Salamma A.O., (2013), The research area for the study was selected is Kanyakumari district and the focus is on Income and Expenditure patterns of farmers. The savings and investment pattern of farmers majorly depends on the income they earn. People who work in the agriculture sector are economically backward. The major source of household disposable income of farmers in the Kanyakumari district is cultivation which accounts for 55.79 percent of total income, followed by income from livestock which constitutes 21.95 percent.

Dr. S. Nakkiran (2004) with objectives problems relating to the implementations of the PDS, benefits derived out of PDS. He concluded that state government is making all efforts to make the PDS more effective by ensuring the availability, affordability and accessibility of PDS articles to the poor. Moreover, they enjoy the participation and involvement of entire village in running FPs. FPs run by SHCs are found cost effective and trouble free.

Dr. Kulwant Pathania, (1996) He suggested that fair price shops should be opened at reasonable distance to ensure that people are not required to walk a long distance to approach the fair price shop. In order to restore regular and timely supply of wheat and rice, the FCI should atleast three months buffer stock of both the commodities at two central places. Ration card should be issued by adopting scientific base and proper vigilance be exercised to eliminate bogus ration cards

III. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The present study is undertaken with the following specific objectives.

1. Average quantity received relative to entitlement and price paid for the purchases by Agriculture Communities.
2. To analyze the association between the economic development and the socio-economic status of farmers.
3. To examine factors motivating while buying in fair price shops.
4. To study about benefits and problems of ration cardholders in fair price shops under Public distribution system.
5. Quality of food grains received from FPS. Access to FPS including distance travelled, transaction time, dealers' attitude.

SAMPLING DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

To generate the necessary database for the study, a sample survey was conducted in the two districts. The allocation of total sample households in the districts was done in proportion to their share of the district's total population. For the current TPDS beneficiary survey, a multi-stage sample design was used. In rural areas, the first, second, and third sampling stages were districts, villages, and households, respectively.

The purpose of the current study is to investigate the problems raised by the objectives and hypotheses regarding the applications and efficiency of fair price shops under public distribution System and its impacts towards agriculture families. The study is based on a survey-based empirical research design. Primary and secondary data were both gathered for the study. The primary information was gathered via a survey method that involved direct personal interviews with ration card participants. The journals, text books, magazines, newspapers, websites, etc. were used to gather secondary data.

IV. DATA ANALYSIS

DISTRIBUTION OF FACTORS MOTIVATING FAMILY CARDHOLDERS TO BUY IN FAIR PRICE SHOPS

S.No	Factors	Co-operative Society	Self – Help Group	Tamil Nadu Civil Supply corporation	Total	Mean score	Ranks
1.	Price	76.8	70.957	71.479	219.236	73.08	1 st
2.	Quantity	43.55	44.426	43.625	131.901	43.97	7 th
3.	Quality	37.345	34.851	30.458	102.654	34.22	8 th
4.	Measurement	33.782	25.383	24.104	83.269	27.76	10 th
5.	Government Norms	33.491	30.085	33.188	96.764	32.25	9 th
6.	Availability of Commodities	47.236	53.830	52.979	154.045	51.35	6 th

A Study on Impacts of Public Distribution System in Welfare of Agriculture Communities

7.	Regular supply	50.145	52.511	52.271	154.927	51.64	5 th
8.	Essentials Commodities to sale	59.818	59.745	58.438	178.001	59.33	3 rd
9.	low Income	50.018	61.553	64.771	176.342	58.78	4 th
10.	Citizen Rights	62.509	61.660	63.688	187.857	62.62	2 nd

The table indicates that price, and citizen rights got first and second ranks followed by essentials commodities to sale, low income, regularity supply, availability of commodities quantity, quality, Government norms, measurement, for 3rd, 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th, 8th, 9th and 10th respectively.

Hence it can be concluded that most of sample ration cardholders motivated by price and citizen rights factors buy in fair price shops.

DISTRIBUTION OF SAMPLE AGRICULTURE FAMILIES ACCORDING TO SATISFACTION LEVEL IN PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM

Satisfaction Level	No of families	Percentage	Average satisfaction score
Low level	111	74	19.60
High level	39	26	27.13
Total	150	100	21.56

The above table shows that 74 percentage of agriculture families has low level satisfied, and 26 percentage of agriculture families has high level satisfaction. 19.60 average satisfaction score have low level satisfaction, 27.13 average satisfaction score have high level satisfaction sample

Hence it can be concluded that most of the agriculture family cardholders had low level satisfaction in public distribution system

**DISTRIBUTION OF FAMILY CARDHOLDERS ON THE BASIS OF THEIR OCCUPATION AND SATISFACTION LEVEL:
CHI – SQUARE TEST**

Occupation	Satisfaction level		Total
	Low level	High level	
Agriculture	51 (85)	9 (15)	60
Agri-alied	10 (76.92)	3 (23.08)	13
Private	38 (69.09)	17 (30.91)	55
Professional	1 (100)	0 (0)	1
Business	11 (52.38)	10 (47.62)	21
Total	111 (74)	39 (26)	150

The above table shows that in a sample of 150 family cardholders, 100 percentage belonging to professional, 85 percent belonging to agriculture, 76.92 percent belonging to government, 69.09 percent belonging to private, have low level satisfaction. 47.62 percent belonging to business, 30.91 percent belonging to private, 23.08 percent belonging to agri-alied have high level satisfaction.

The calculate value of Chi – Square test is 9.973 higher than table value 9.49 at 5% significant. There is a significant relationship between occupation and their satisfaction level, hence hypothesis is rejected.

AVERAGE SATISFACTION SCORE OF SAMPLE FAMILY CARDHOLDERS ON THE BASIS OF THEIR TYPES OF FAMILY: Z - TEST

Types of family	N	Mean difference	Standard Deviation	Standard Error	Z
Nuclear	131	2.0707	4.22	1.0359	1.998
Joint	19				

The calculate value of Z – test is 1.998 higher than table value 1.96 at 5% level of significant. Hence average satisfaction score of the two groups of the sample family cardholders is not same in basis of their type – of family. Hence hypothesis is rejected.

DISTRIBUTION OF FAMILY CARDHOLDERS ON THE BASIS OF THEIR FAMILY MONTHLY INCOME AND SATISFACTION LEVEL CHI-SQUARE TEST

Family Monthly Income	Satisfaction low level		Total
	Low level	High level	
Low level	90 (78.26)	25 (21.74)	115 (100)
Medium level	4 (44.44)	5 (55.56)	9 (100)
High level	17 (65.38)	9 (34.62)	26 (100)
Total	111 (74)	39 (26)	150 (100)

(Figures in the parentheses denote percentage)

The table 4.20 depicts that in a sample of 150 family cardholders, 78.26 percentage belonging to low level, 65.38 percent belonging to high level, 44.44 percent belonging to medium level income groups, have low level satisfaction. 55.56 percent belonging to medium level, 34.62 percent belonging to high level, 21.74 percent belonging to low level income groups have high level satisfaction.

The calculation value of chi-square is 6.174 higher than table value 5.99 at 5% significant level there is significant relationship between satisfaction level and their family monthly income hypothesis is not accepted.

AVERAGE SATISFACTION SCORE OF SAMPLE FAMILY CARDHOLDERS ON THE BASIS OF THEIR FAMILY MONTHLY INCOME ANOVA TEST

Source of variation	Sum of square	Degree of Freedom	Mean square	F value	Sig
Between sample	252.814	2	126.407	7.723	.001
With in samples		147	16.368		
Total	2658.960	149			

The calculate of value of anova is 7.723 significant is .001 (0.1:%). This is significant at 5% level. There fore average satisfaction score of sample family cardholders is not same on the basis of their family monthly income hence hypothesis is not accepted.

AVERAGE SATISFACTION SCORE OF SAMPLE FAMILY CARDHOLDERS ON THE BASIS OF THEIR NO OF EARNING MEMBERS IN FAMILY ANOVA TEST

Source of variation	Sum of square	Degree of Freedom	Mean square	F value	Sig
Between sample	17.837	2	8.918	.496	.610
With in samples	2641.123	147	17.967		
Total	2658.960	149			

The calculate value of F – test is .496 significant is .610 (.61%). This is insignificant at 5% level. Therefore average satisfaction score of the three groups of the sample family cardholders is the same on the basis of their number of earning members in family. Hence hypothesis is accepted.

AVERAGE SATISFACTION SCORE FAMILY CARDHOLDERS ON THE BASIS OF THEIR TYPE OF CARD F-TEST

Source Variation	Sum of Squares	Degrees Freedom	Mean Square	F Value	Sig
Between Samples	81.015	1	81.015	4.651	.033
Within samples	2577.945	148	17.419		
Total	2658.960	149			

Calculate value of Anova is 4.651 significant is .033 (3.3%). This is significant at 5% level. Therefore average satisfaction score of the three groups of the sample family cardholders is not same on the basis of their type of card, Hypothesis is not accepted.

AVERAGE SATISFACTION SCORE OF SAMPLE FAMILY CARDHOLDERS ON THE BASIS OF THEIR TYPE OF SHOPS

Type of card	No. of family cardholders	Average satisfaction score
Co-operative Society	55[36.67]	24.4
TNCSC	48[32]	20.77
Self – Help Group	47[31.33]	19.04
Total	150[100]	21.56

The table 4.36 indicates that Co-operative society shop sample family cardholders 24.4 percentage average satisfaction score, followed by TamilNadu civil supply corporation, self – Help Groups shops sample family cardholders had 20.77, 19.04 average satisfaction score respectively, It proposed to test the hypothesis average satisfaction score of the three groups of the family cardholders is the same on the basis of their type of shops. Analysis of variance tested.

BENEFITS OBTAINED BY CARDHOLDERS IN FAIR PRICE SHOPS

S.No.	Benefits	I 5	II 4	III 3	IV 2	V 1	Total	Mean Score	Ranks
1	Regular supply	10 50	24 96	22 66	30 60	64 64	150 336	2.24	5 th
2	More Quantity at Cheap Rate	106 530	12 48	16 48	11 22	5 5	150 653	4.35	1 st
3	Sale Essential Commodity	12 60	66 264	37 111	20 40	15 15	150 490	3.27	2 nd
4	Availability of Commodity	2 10	18 72	43 129	52 104	35 35	150 350	2.33	4 th
5	Buying Rights	20 100	30 120	32 96	37 74	31 31	150 421	2.81	3 rd
	Total	150	150	150	150	150			

The table 5.1 depicts that more quantity at cheap rate benefit is the main benefit enjoyed by the cardholders followed by sale essential commodities with 2nd rank. Buying rights, availability of commodities, regular supply benefits got 3rd 4th and 5th ranks respectively.

V. SUGGESTIONS

- Most of agriculture communities are not able to purchase certain commodities due to non-availability of goods. Hence It is suggested that Tamil Nadu civil supply corporation has to distribute essential commodities to fair price shops in right time in right quantity on the basis of number of cardholders of fair price shops. The Government should take necessary steps to avoid fraudulent activities of workers like sale of commodities to private shops.
- Most of the Agriculture and allied employees have low level satisfaction. The Government should take necessary steps to improve satisfaction level of family cardholders.
- More number of family cardholders used fair price shops commodities with in fifteen days. Hence It is suggested that the Government should take necessary steps to distribute adequate quantity of commodities to the families.
- Most of the sample family cardholders are unable to get additional commodities festival seasons. Hence the Government should take necessary steps to ensure additional commodities to all family cardholders in festival seasons.

In present study co-operative society fair price shop family cardholders are having average satisfaction score compared to SHG and TNCSC fair price shops. Hence it is suggested that the concerned authorities should take necessary steps to improve the satisfaction of family cardholders.

VI. CONCLUSION

The analysis was made based on the data collected from the agriculture and allied employee's family cardholders in different fair price shops in the study area. Based on the findings of the study some useful and viable suggestions were also given in this study. If the Tamil Nadu Government takes necessary steps in this regard, a positive result can be expected in the uses and effectiveness of fair price shops.

REFERENCE:

- [1]. Acosta, P., Fajnzylber, P. and H. Lopez (2007), "The Impact of Remittances on Poverty and Human Capital: Evidence from Latin American Household Surveys", World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 4 247.
- [2]. Anderson, K. and E. Valenzuela (2008), Estimates of Global Distortions to Agricultural Incentives, 1955 to 2007, World Bank, Washington, DC, October 2008. ASTI-IFPRI (2009), Database on Agricultural Science and Technology Indicators, IFPRI.
- [3]. Bresciani, F. and A. Valdés (2007), Beyond Food Production: The Role of Agriculture in Poverty Reduction, FAO, Rome. Byerlee, D. de Janvry, A. and E. Sadoulet (2009), "Agriculture for Development: Toward a New Paradigm", Annual Review of Resource Economics, Vol. 1: 15-35, October 2009.
- [4]. Cervantes-Godoy, D. and J. Brooks (2008), "Smallholder Adjustment in Middle-Income Countries: Issues and Policy Responses", OECD Food, Agriculture and Fisheries Working Papers, No. 12,
- [5]. Ahluwalia, Montek, S (2000), "Economic Performances of States in Post Reforms Period", Economic and Political Weekly, Vol.35, May 6.
- [6]. Alagh, Y.K. (1994), "Macro Policies for Indian Agriculture" in G.S. Bhalla (ed.), Economic Liberalisation and Indian Agriculture, Institute for Studies in Industrial Development, New Delhi. Chadha (2003), "Indian Agriculture in the New Millennium: Human Response to Technology Challenges", Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics, Vol.58, No.1, January-March
- [7]. Chand, Ramesh (2000), "Emerging Trends and Regional Variations in Agricultural Investments and Their Implications for Growth and Equity", Policy Paper-11, National Centre for Agricultural Economics and Policy Research, New Delhi.
- [8]. Chand, Ramesh (2001), "Emerging Trends and Issues in Public and Private Investment in Indian Agriculture: A State-wise Analysis", Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics, Vol.56, No.2, April-June.