# Southern Economist 2013

### Social Security for women and Microfinance An empirical study of Shivamogga District

## 51st Year of Publication

Particulars	Responses	No of Respondents	Percentage	relationship between and Employment Issu			
Age(Years)	25 to 30	9	36.0	security factor).			
war(   per e)	30 to 35	9	36.0	V. Ho: There is no sig			
	35 to 40	7	28.0	tionship between microl			
	35 10 40			Financial Issue (social sec			
Total		25	100	VI. Ho: There is no relationship between			
Education Status	Illiterate	7	28.0	and Social Issue (soc			
	Primary	6	24.0	factor).			
	Middle	3	12.0	Research Design			
	Secondary & above	0 9	36.0	The study is based or			
Total		25	100	data. Primary data has cted through structured of			
Poverty Status	BPL	15	57.5	and interview with			
	APL	10	42.5	beneficiaries. The scope is restricted to Shiver			
Total	25	100		Karnataka State and to			
Family Status	Joint family	11	44.0	security factors such education, health,			
	Nuclear family	14	56.0	financial issue and so			
Total		25	100	relation with microfinano sample constitutes 25 m			
No of dependents of	1 10 3	18	45.0	different SHGs in Shive			
Respondents	3 to 6	14	35.0	and a simple randor technique was employed			
	6 to 9	6	15.0	respondents in the st			
	9 & above	2	5.0	point scale has been use response. In order to			
	0 0 00010			hypothesis simple one			
Total		25	100	was applied.			
	1 to 3	14	56.0	Discussion of the Study			
No of Children	3 to 6	5	20.0	Table-1 presents			
	6 to 9	6	24.0	particulars of the respo			
Total		25	100	70% of the respondents 25 to 35 years, 36			
Monthly Income	Below 2000	4	16.0	respondents stated			
of Husband	200 to 4000	6	24.0	secondary education qu			
	400 to 6000	2	8.0	above 60% of the respor- to be below poverty line.			
	600 to 8000	5	20.0	to be in a nuclear fa			
	800 to 10000	7	25.0	respondents stated to			
	1000 & above	4	16.0	children. An income cla			
Total	92	25	100.0	households of the revealed the predomin			

1/3

lousing Factors			e-2 – Housir				
lousing Factors			0	ne-Sample Test			-
	t	df	Sig.	est Value = 0 Mean	95% Confiden	ce Interval	
			(2-tailed)	Difference	of the Lower	Difference Upper	Resu
Construction of house	11.072	24	.000	2.240	1.82	2.66	Rejecte
Nater connection/access o clean water	11.476	24	.000	2.040	1.67	2.41	Rejecte
Construction of toilet ighting facility	12.730 11.476	24 24	.000	2.120	1.78	2.46	Rejecte Rejecte
	11.410	- 337			1.07	2.41	riejecie
		Table	-3 - Educati	on Issues ne-Sample Test			
Education Issue	i.	df	Sig.	est Value = 0 Mean	95% Confiden	ce Interval	
			(2-tailed)	Difference	of the Lower	Difference Upper	Resu
Access to further education	12.050	24	.000	2.520	2.09	2.95	Rejecte
Children education Participation in self	9.859 9.656	24 24	.000	1.800	1.42	2.18	Rejecte
development programme							Rejecte
Attending training programme	11.047	24	.000	2.480	2.02	2.94	Rejecte
		Table	5 – Employn				
		Table.		ne-Sample Test			
Employment Issue	t	df		est Value = 0 Mean	95% Confiden	ce Interval	
		1,00	(2-tailed)	Difference	of the	Difference	Resu
Agricultural/ Non	11.619	24	.000	3.000	2.47	3.53	Rejecte
Agricultural activities			5		7000 770		
Self employment Added value to work	8.687 6.230	24 24	.000	2.760 1.880	2.10 1.26	3.42 2.50	Rejecte Rejecte
Source: Primary Source							
Source. Finlary Source							
80						Apri	1 15, 201
		51st ]	Year of Pu	blication )—			
			Table-4				
			Health Issu	ne-Sample Test			
Health Issue	t	ď	Te Sig.	st Value = 0 Mean	95% Confiden	ce Interval	
			(2-tailed)	Difference	of the Lower	Difference Upper	Resu
Access to nutrition	9.939	24	.000	2.440	1.93	2.95	Rejecte
Conscious about hygiene	10.914	24	.000	2.120	1.72	2.52	Rejecte
factors							
Family planning awareness	10.445	24	.000	2.000	1.60	2.40	Rejecte
Participation in health campaign	9.656	24	.000	2.080	1.64	2.52	Rejecte
Arranging health camp  Access to health insurance	9.702 9.168	24	.000	2.760	2.17	3.35 2.89	Rejecte
The second secon	0.100		.000	2.500	1.63	2.00	rsejecte
			Table-6 Financial Iss	ues			
Financial Issue	_		0	ne-Sample Test		_	
rinanciai issue	τ	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confiden	Difference	Resu
	-	_			Lower	Upper	
Earning Savings	6.743	24	.000	1.880	1.30	2.46	Rejecte
Access to Credit	6.743 7.746	24	.000	2.000	1.30	2.46	Rejecte
Knowledge about cash	8.220	24	.000	2.240	1.68	2.80	Rejecte
cook, account maintenance Financial asset purchase	12.338	24	.000	2.480	2.07	2.89	Rejecte
Purchase of vehicles	10.559	24	.000	2.880	2.32	3.44	Rejecte
Land purchase	19.468	24	.000	3.680	3.29	4.07	Rejecte
Household purchase investment (Business Activities)	8.375	24	.000	2.680	1.88	3.34	Rejecte
	0.000		.000	2.520	1.88	3.16	Rejecte
Source:Primary Source							
April 15, 2013	_						3
-	<u> </u>	91st 1		blication )-			
			Table-7 Social Issu	ies			
locial Issue			O.	ne-Sample Test est Value = 0			
	1	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confident	ce Interval Difference	Resu
		N***	Towns -	0.217	Lower	Upper	70000000
Standard of Living	10.914	24	.000	2.120	1.72	2.52	Rejecte
Recognition in Society	10.914	24	.000	2.120	1.72	2.52	Rejecte
attending social programme	9.526	24	.000	2.200	1.62	2.46	Rejecti
Confidence Level	9.632	24	.000	1.920	1.51	2.33	Rejecte
Inowledge about ocial/legal/political	10.817	24	.000	1.840	1.49	2.19	Rejecte
Jrge for development	11.298	24	.000	1.760	1.44	2.08	Rejecte
Source: Primary Source			-	-			
followed by Rs.2001-4000 (24%) and res 2001-2000 (27%). as strongly agree and 10% said same files officed as a South Security Fators Microffanace and Housing Issue Hypothesial Testing a. 10: There is no significant relationship between microffiance and power following 26% of the responders to the responders and relationship between microffiance and power fooling 26% of the responders to the responders and relationship between microffiance and power fooling 26% of the responders to the responders and power fooling 26% of					have availed the loan facility which they have diverted for the oth purposes like daily consumptic repaying of loan amount etc. Th study results reveal significan relationship between micro finance and housing facility.  Microfinance and Education Hypothesis Testing		
actor).  H1: There is a significal collationship between microfinare of Houseling Facility (accidal securative).  Result: in the study, 44% of its espondents agreed that after join H14% of the respondents start of the study, 44% of the respondents start has shaulion same as before 48% here respondents agreed that all onling SHGs they got we	bef set	Microfi in p need jority or refly li rofinar facil me, to ler naining k acce	nance playi roviding soci by people if f the respond ne and their soci instituti ity for the silets and if different some percentage less to this	ng prominent all security for a society. As dents fall below income is low, one providing construction of giphing facility chemes, the of respondents facility. In the und that they	b. Ho: T relationship and Education H1: The relationship and Education Result: In respondents access to fu	here is no between in (social secu- ie is a between in (social secu- the study, in agreed that ther educat the reducat	signification si

