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#### Abstract

The present study was conducted in Jaipur district of Rajasthan. A sample of 221 farmer borrowers was selected by using the random sampling technique. The results of repayment performance of credit indicated that only $81.27 \%$ of short-term credit, $84.34 \%$ of medium-term credit and $77.82 \%$ of long-term bank credit was repaid by due date and the remaining amount was overdue as on due date. The repayment performance of co-operative credit for rabi season was $92.62 \%$ and that for kharif season was $95.44 \%$. It was higher as compared to banks. The results also indicated that out of 221 farmer borrowers, $124(56.11 \%)$ were non-defaulters and 97 ( 43.89 per cent) were defaulters. The percentage defaulters among the farmer borrowers ranged from as high as $61.11 \%$ in the large farmer borrowers to as low as 36.36 \% in the marginal farmer borrowers. The regression results revealed that out of eleven explanatory variables only seven variables significantly affected the overdues of defaulters, however, their degrees and numbers varied from category to category. Out of these significant variables, four variables viz., amount borrowed, amount put to un-productive purposes, expenditures on family consumption and old debts were positively and the remaining three variables viz., gross farm income, non-farm income and cropping intensity negatively influenced the overdues.
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Despite the sharp rise in the major sectors of economy, the agriculture sector is still the single biggest sector contributes about $14 \%$ to the GDP and employing nearly 60 percent of its workforce of our country.But, the significant contribution of some other factors such as irrigation facilities, labour, fertilizers \& pesticides, seeds, etc. to the growth of agriculture is compulsory. For acquiring the required inputs, farmer needs credit as his financial sustainability.The agricultural credit includes the amount of loans disbursed in cash and kind to the farmer borrowers for fulfills their farm requirements. In India, a multi-agency approach consisting of Commercial Banks (CBs), Regional Rural Banks (RRBs) and Co-operatives has been followed for disbursing credit to agricultural sector. The institutionalization of agricultural credit is helpful for the farmer borrowers but the problem of overdues is most common for all the financial agencies. It directly affects the refinance ability of the financial institutions because
when the overdue amount increases the loanable amount is blocked, thereby bringing down the steps of agricultural development. So, repayment of credit is of foremost importance to all the financial institutions.Therefore, an attempt was made to explore the different factors that are responsible for creditoverdues and analyzing the repaymentperformance of agricultural credit in the study area.Briefly, this study will beneficial to guide the policy makers for the formulation of future lending policy in agricultural sector.

## Methodology

The study examined the repayment performance and factorsaffecting overdues of institutional agricultural credit in Jaipur district of Rajasthan. It was carried out in two panchayatsamitis namely; Govindgarh and Sambhar Lake out of the thirteen panchayatsamitis of the district. From each panchayatsamiti, two gram panchayats were selected at random and all the villages falling within the selected gram panchayatschosen for further investigation.In order to select the farmer borrowers, a list of all the institutional farmer borrowers along with the advances made to them was taken from the records of all the financial agencies falling within the study area. The farmer borrowers categorized into five standard categories on the basis of their size of holdings and $15 \%$ farmer borrowers were selected at random from each category as per probability proportion. The sample strength was 221 which consisted of 55 marginal, 51 small, 45 semi-medium, 52 medium and 18 large farmer. The secondary data relating to credit repayment and its overdues were collected from the records maintained by the concerned financial institutions in the study area. The data were statistically tabulated and analyzed by calculating simple percentages and averages to arrive at the objective specific results. The payable amount of loan, unpaid upto due date was considered as the amount of overdue. It was calculated with help of the following method.

$$
\begin{aligned}
\text { Overdues }= & \{(\text { Amount to be paid during the year } \\
& + \text { Amount overdue at the beginning of the year }) \\
& - \text { Amount actually paid during the year }\}
\end{aligned}
$$

The extent of overdues was measured as the ratio of amount overdue to the amount of loan due for repayment and was expressed in terms of percentage. The extent of overdues was calculated as:

Extent of overdues $=\frac{\text { Amount overdue }}{\text { Amount due for repayment }} \times 100$
The total amount of loan due for repayment included the principal amount and the interest accrued thereon. The repayment performance of the farmer borrowers was measured in terms of percentage of amount repaid to the amount due for repayment in the given period. The repayment performance was calculated with help of the given formula.

Repayment performance $=\frac{\text { Amount repaid }}{\text { Amount due for repayment }} \times 100$

The factors affecting overdues of the defaulter farmer borrowers in the study area were identified by regressing overdues on the following explanatory variables:

Where,
$\mathrm{Y}=$ overdues ( $\left.\mathrm{F}^{\mathrm{F}}\right)$
$\mathrm{x}_{1}=$ gross farm income (₹)
$\mathrm{x}_{2}=$ non-farm income ( $\left.\mathrm{F}^{2}\right)$
$\mathrm{x}_{3}=$ amount borrowed (₹)
$\mathrm{x}_{4}=$ cropping intensity (\%)
$\mathrm{x}_{5}=$ repayment capacity (₹)
$\mathrm{x}_{6}=$ amount put to productive purposes $(₹)$
$\mathrm{x}_{7}=$ amount put to unproductive purposes $(₹)$
$\mathrm{x}_{8}=$ expenditures on family consumption (₹)
$\mathrm{x}_{9}=$ farm expenses $(₹)$
$\mathrm{x}_{10}=$ total land holding (ha), and
$\mathrm{x}_{11}=$ Old debts (₹)
Both linear and log-linear forms of the multiple regression function as shown below were fitted to the data using the Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) technique.
(i) Multiple linear regression equation:
$\mathrm{Y}=\mathrm{a}+\mathrm{b}_{1} \mathrm{X}_{1}+\mathrm{b}_{2} \mathrm{X}_{2}+\mathrm{b}_{3} \mathrm{X}_{3}+$ $\qquad$ $+\mathrm{b}_{11} \mathrm{X}_{11}+\mathrm{U}$
(ii) Multiple log-linear (Cobb-Douglas) regression equation:
$\mathrm{Y}=\mathrm{a} \mathrm{X}_{1}^{\mathrm{b} 1} \mathrm{X}_{2}^{\mathrm{b} 2} \mathrm{X}_{3}^{\mathrm{b} 3} \cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots \mathrm{X}_{11}^{\mathrm{b} 11} 10^{\mathrm{U}}$
This on log transformation takes followingform:
$\log \mathrm{Y}=$ Long $\mathrm{a}+\mathrm{b}_{1} \log \mathrm{X}_{1}+\mathrm{b}_{2} \log \mathrm{X}_{2}+\ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots .+\mathrm{b}_{11} \log \mathrm{x}_{11}+\mathrm{U}$
The magnitude of multicollinearity was analyzed by considering the size of the VIF ( $\mathbf{b}_{\mathfrak{j}}$ ). A common rule of thumb followed was that if VIF $\left(b_{i}\right)>10$ then, it was taken to near high multicollinearity (Kutner, 2004).The regression results exhibited the problem of multicollinearity among the explanatory variables. Therefore, for deciding on the best set of explanatory variables for the regression model stepwise forward regression method was used. The decision to add a variable was made on the basis of the contribution of that variable to the Error Sum of Squares (ESS) as judged by the 'F' test. Significance of regression coefficients were tested on the basis of two tailed student's 't' test. Elasticity coefficients
were also computed to know the percent change in the overdues due to one percent change in respective explanatory variable. as the number of defaulters in the large farmer borrowers' category was not sufficient enough to run the regression analysis, this category was merged with medium category to form 'medium cum large category' for capturing its effect. Pooled analysis was also attempted to identify the causal factors of overdues in the study area at the aggregate level.

## Results and Discussion

## (A) Repayment performance and extent of overdues of bank credit

(i) Short-term bank credit: The repayment performance and extent of overdues of short-term bank credit are illustrated in Table 1. It is obvious from the table that the short-term credit repayable to the banks was ₹ 11,355 . Out of which ₹ $9,178(81.27 \%)$ was repaid by repayable date and the remaining $₹ 2,177(18.73 \%)$ stood as overdues. The per farm due amount was varied from $₹ 6,191$ on marginal farms to $₹ 21,666$ on large sixed farms. the percentage of repaid amount to repayable amount was highest ( $91.58 \%$ ) on marginal farms followed by $89.59 \%$ on small, $88.43 \%$ on semi-medium, 76.12 $\%$ on medium and $73.10 \%$ on large sized farms.Obviously, the extent of overdues was varied from $8.42 \%$ to $26.90 \%$ on marginal to large sized farms.It was positively associated with the increase in the size of holdings.

Table 1: Disbursement, repayment and overdues of short-term credit (In rupees)

| Size groups | Amount |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Borrowed |  | Repayable |  | Repaid |  | Overdue |  |  |
|  | per farm | per hectare | per farm | per hectare | per farm | per hectare | per farm | per hectare |  |
| Marginal | 5774 | 11104 | $6191(100.00)$ | 11906 | $5670(91.58)$ | 10904 | $521(8.42)$ | 1002 |  |
| Small | 6503 | 4516 | $6995(100.00)$ | 4858 | $6267(89.59)$ | 4352 | $728(10.41)$ | 506 |  |
| Semi-medium | 6727 | 2288 | $7266(100.00)$ | 2471 | $6425(88.43)$ | 2185 | $841(11.57)$ | 286 |  |
| Medium | 19604 | 3741 | $21062(100.00)$ | 4019 | $16032(76.12)$ | 3059 | $5030(23.88)$ | 960 |  |
| Large | 19892 | 1789 | $21666(100.00)$ | 1948 | $15838(73.10)$ | 1424 | $5828(26.90)$ | 524 |  |
| Overall | 10540 | 3294 | $11355(100.00)$ | 3548 | $9228(81.27)$ | 2884 | $2127(18.73)$ | 664 |  |

Figures in parentheses are the percentages to the total
the per hectare average amount of short-term credit repayable by due date was worked out as ₹ 11,906 for marginal, ₹ 4,858 for small, ₹ 2,471 semi-medium, ₹ 4,019 for medium and ₹ 1,948 for large farmer borrowers. The highest amount (₹ 10,904 ) repaid by the marginal former borrowersfollowed by small, medium, semi-medium and large farmer borrowers. The share of overdues was found to be highest ( $₹ 1,002$ ) for marginal farmer borrowers and lowest ( $₹ 286$ ) for the semi-medium farmer borrowers.
(ii) medium-term bank credit: The information with regard to per farm amount repayable, repaid and overdues of medium-term bank credit by the due date and its repayment performance are presented in table 2. It is clear from the table that the per farm repayable amount as on 30.06 .2008 was
₹ 13,123 . Out of which, $83.34 \%$ (₹ 10,937 ) was repaid by the due date and the remaining $16.66 \%$ (₹ 2,186) stood as overdues. The amount repayable was highest (₹ 23,658 ) for large sized farmer borrowers followed by medium, semi-medium, marginal and small farmer borrowers. The repayment performance was found to be highest ( $91.87 \%$ ) for marginal farmers followed by small, semi-medium, medium and large farmer borrowers.

Table 2: Disbursement, repayment and overdues medium-term bank credit

| Size groups | Amount |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Borrowed |  | Repayable <br> (as on 30.6.08) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Repaid <br> (up to 30.6.08) |  | Overdue <br> (as on 30.6.08) |
|  | per farm | per hectare | per farm | per hectare | per farm | per hectare | per farm | per hectare |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Marginal | 9189 | 17671 | $9608(100.00)$ | 18477 | $8827(91.87)$ | 16975 | $781(8.13)$ | 1502 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Small | 12699 | 8819 | $9533(100.00)$ | 6620 | $8291(86.97)$ | 5758 | $1242(13.03)$ | 862 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Semi-medium | 14373 | 4889 | $11069(100.00)$ | 3765 | $9027(81.55)$ | 3070 | $2042(18.45)$ | 695 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Medium | 30020 | 5729 | $18492(100.00)$ | 3529 | $14982(81.02)$ | 2859 | $3510(18.98)$ | 670 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Large | 38164 | 3432 | $23658(100.00)$ | 2127 | $17971(75.96)$ | 1616 | $5687(24.04)$ | 511 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Overall | 18316 | 5724 | $13123(100.00)$ | 4101 | $10937(83.34)$ | 3418 | $2186(16.66)$ | 683 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Figures in parentheses are the percentages to the total
On the hand, the respective extent of overdues for such farmers was estimated at $8.13 \%, 13.03 \%$, $18.45 \%, 18.98 \%$ and $24.04 \%$. It was noted to be positively associated with increase in the size of holdings. The per hectare overdue amount of medium term credit was highest for marginal farmer borrowers ( $₹ 1,502$ ) followed by small farmers ( $₹ 862$ ), semi-medium farmers ( $₹ 695$ ), medium farmer ( $₹ 670$ ) and large farmer borrowers ( $₹ 511$ ). The repayable, repaid and overdue amount were inversely related to the size of holdings.
(iii) long-term bank credit: The repayment performance together with extent of overdues of longterm bank credit is presented in table 3. It is obvious from the table that the repayable amount of longterm bank credit was ₹ 34,541 . Out of which, 77.82 \% (₹ 26,879 ) was repaid by the due date and the remaining 22.18 \% ( $₹ 7,662$ ) stood as overdues. The per farm repayable amount was ranged from ₹ 15,605 to ₹ $1,0,3751$ on marginal to large farmer borrowers. On the other hand, the repaid amount was varied from ₹ 13,392 by small farmer borrowers to ₹ 76,902 large farmer borrowers. The extent of overdues was $14.18 \%, 21.14 \%, 22.59 \%$ and $25.88 \%$ to small, semi-medium medium and large farmer borrowers, respectively. The average per hectare repayable amount of long-term credit was observed to be highest ( $₹ 13,381$ ) for semi-medium farmer borrowers followed by medium ( $₹ 11,743$ ), small ( $₹ 10,837$ ) and large ( $₹ 9,330$ ) farmer borrowers.

Table 3: Disbursement, repayment and overdues long-term bank credit

| Size groups | Amount |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Borrowed | Repayable <br> (as on 30.6.08) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Repaid <br> (up to 30.6.08) | Overdue <br> (as on 30.6.08) |
|  | per farm | per hectare | per farm | per hectare | per farm | per hectare | per farm | per hectare |  |  |  |  |  |
| Marginal | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |
| Small | 22655 | 15732 | $15605(100.00)$ | 10837 | $13392(85.82)$ | 9300 | $2213(14.18)$ | 1537 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Semi-medium | 67723 | 23035 | $39341(100.00)$ | 13381 | $31025(78.86)$ | 10553 | $8316(21.14)$ | 2828 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Medium | 109251 | 20850 | $61536(100.00)$ | 11743 | $47632(77.41)$ | 9090 | $13904(22.59)$ | 2653 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Large | 184999 | 16636 | $103751(100.00)$ | 9330 | $76902(74.12)$ | 6916 | $26849(25.88)$ | 2414 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Overall | 59792 | 18685 | $34541(100.00)$ | 10794 | $26879(77.82)$ | 8400 | $7662(22.18)$ | 2394 |  |  |  |  |  |

Figures in parentheses are the percentages to the total
On the other hand, the repaid amount was found to be highest for semi-medium farmer borrowersand lowest for large farmer borrowers.

## (B) Repayment performance and extent of overdues of co-operative credit

(i) Rabi season co-operative credit: The overall co-operative credit repayable by the farmers as on May 31, 2006 in rabi season was ₹ 8,892 . Out of which $92.62 \%$ was repaid in time and the remaining $7.38 \%$ was overdue (Table 4). The per farm average dues was varied from ₹ 7,267 to ₹ 10,375 for marginal to large farmer borrowers.the repayment performance was assessed as $93.45 \%$ for marginal, $93.12 \%$ for small, $92.52 \%$ for semi-medium, $92.32 \%$ for medium and $90.81 \%$ for large farmer borrowers. It was increased with the increase in the size of holdings. On the other hand, the extent of overdues for the same farmer borrowers was calculated as $6.55 \%, 6.88 \%, 7.48 \%, 7.68 \%$ and 9.19 $\%$ in that order. The extent of overdues during the season increased with the increase in the size of holdings. The per hectare amount repayable, repaid and overdue were inversely related to the size of holdings.

Table 4: Disbursement, repayment and overdues short-term co-operative credit
(in ₹)

| Size groups | Amount (Rabi season) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Borrowed |  | Repayable as on May 31, 2006 |  | Repaid upto <br> May 31, 2006 |  | Overdue as on June 1, 2006 |  |
|  | per farm | per hectare | per farm | per hectare | per farm | per hectare | per farm | per hectare |
| Marginal | 7011 | 13482 | 7267(100.00) | 13975 | 6791(93.45) | 13060 | 476(6.55) | 915 |
| Small | 8180 | 5680 | 8475(100.00) | 5885 | 7892(93.12) | 5480 | 583(6.88) | 405 |
| Semi-medium | 9119 | 3102 | 9482(100.00) | 3225 | 8773(92.52) | 2984 | 709(7.48) | 241 |
| Medium | 9537 | 1820 | 9995(100.00) | 1907 | 9227(92.32) | 1761 | 768(7.68) | 146 |
| Large | 9912 | 891 | 10375(100.00) | 933 | 9422(90.81) | 847 | 953(9.19) | 86 |
| Overall | 8541 | 2669 | 8892(100.00) | 2779 | 8236(92.62) | 2574 | 656(7.38) | 205 |

Figures in parentheses are the percentages to the total

Kharif season co-operative credit: the details about the average per farm amount repayable, repaid and overdue of kharif season co-operative credit and its repayment performance with extent of overdues are presented in table 5. The table shows that the average co-operative credit repayable as on Feb. 28, 2007 in kharif season was ₹ 9,440 . Out of this, $95.44 \%$ (₹ 9,009 ) was repaid in time and the remaining $4.56 \%(₹ 431)$ was overdue. The amount repaid as percentage of repayable amount was observed more or less same for all the size groups. Similarly, no any particular trend was observed in extent of overdues. The per hectare amount repayable, repaid and overdue decreased with increase in the size of holding. The extent of overdues in Rabi season was higher ( $7.38 \%$ ) as compared to the kharif season $(4.56 \%)$ because of more farm income from crop production during kharifseason.The farm income from crop production was higher in kharifseason because the overall total cropped area was highest (49.20) \% in kharifseason as compared to rabiseason ( $44.21 \%$ ) and zaidseason ( $6.22 \%$ ).

Table 5: Disbursement, repayment and overdues short-term co-operative credit
(in ₹)

| Size groups | Amount (Kharif season) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Borrowed | Repayable as on <br> Feb. 28, 2007 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Repaid upto <br> Feb. 28, 2007 | Overdue as on <br> March 1, 2007 |
|  | per farm | per hectare | per farm | per hectare | per farm | per hectare | per farm | per hectare |  |  |  |
|  | 7257 | 13956 | $7534(100.00)$ | 14488 | $7161(95.05)$ | 13771 | $373(4.95)$ | 717 |  |  |  |
| Marginal | 8250 | 5729 | $8601(100.00)$ | 5973 | $8189(95.21)$ | 5687 | $412(4.79)$ | 286 |  |  |  |
| Small | 10026 | 3410 | $10406(100.00)$ | 3539 | $9991(96.01)$ | 3398 | $415(3.99)$ | 141 |  |  |  |
| Semi-medium | 10301 | 1966 | $10767(100.00)$ | 2055 | $10272(95.40)$ | 1960 | $495(4.60)$ | 95 |  |  |  |
| Medium | 10988 | 988 | $11396(100.00)$ | 1025 | $1087(95.41)$ | 978 | $523(4.59)$ | 47 |  |  |  |
| Large | 9070 | 2834 | $9440(100.00)$ | 2950 | $9009(95.44)$ | 2815 | $431(4.56)$ | 135 |  |  |  |
| Overall |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Figures in parentheses are the percentages to the total
Table 6 revealed that out of 221 farmer borrowers, 124 ( $56.11 \%$ ) were non-defaulters and 97 (43.89 $\%$ ) was defaulters.

Table 6: Category-wise defaulter farmer borrowers

| Size groups | Total number of defaulters | Total number of non-defaulters | Total number of borrowers |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Marginal | $20(36.36)$ | $35(63.64)$ | $55(100.00)$ |
| Small | $21(41.18)$ | $30(58.82)$ | $51(100.00)$ |
| Semi-medium | $19(42.22)$ | $26(27.78)$ | $45(100.00)$ |
| Medium | $26(50.00)$ | $26(50.00)$ | $52(100.00)$ |
| Large | $11(61.11)$ | $7(38.89)$ | $18(100.00)$ |
| All total | $97(43.89)$ | $124(56.11)$ | $221(100.00)$ |

Figures in parenthesis are the percentages to the total

The percentage defaulters among the farmer borrowers ranged from as high as $61.11 \%$ in the large farmer borrowers to as low as $36.36 \%$ in the marginal farmer borrowers. The percentage of defaulters increased with the increase in the size of holdings. It might be attributed to be increase in the diversion of un-productive loan amount with increase the size of land holdings.

## (C) Factors affecting overdues of institutional agricultural credit

The linear regression results finally obtained and considered for discussion on the basis of stepwise regression method are presented in Table 7. In respect of marginal farmer defaulters, the regression results revealed that the coefficient of non-farm income ( $\mathrm{X}_{2}=-0.12$ ) was significantly negative at 5 \%level of significance. It may be attributed to the fact that with the increase in level of non-farm income, the farmers would be able to repay the borrowed loan easily. The coefficient of old debts ( $\mathrm{X}_{11}$ $=0.18)$ was significantly positive at $1 \%$ level of significance. It means the overdues increased with increase in the amount of old debts because the already indebted farmer defaulters were unable to repay the amount of institutional loans in stipulated time period. These two explanatory variables together accounted for $84.48 \%$ variation in the overdues. The elasticity coefficients indicated that $1 \%$ increase in non-farm income decreased the overdues by $0.86 \%$ and $1 \%$ increase in old debts increased the overdues by $2.52 \%$.

In relation to small farmer, the regression coefficient for amount put to unproductive purposes ( $\mathrm{X}_{7}=$ 0.27 ) was significantly positive at $1 \%$ level of significance. This was due to the fact that the amount of loan put to un-productive purposes reduced the amount of loan meant for productive purposes thereby resulting into low income to repay the loan. Similarly, the regression coefficient for old debts $\left(\mathrm{X}_{11}=0.21\right)$ was also significantly positive at $10 \%$ level of significance indicating that larger the amount of old debts, higher was the amount of overdues because higher amount of old debts had adverse impact on the availability of funds for repaying the loan. The coefficient of determination ( $\mathrm{R}^{2}$ ) was 0.8610 indicating that $86.10 \%$ of variation in overdues was explained by the explanatory variables included in the model. The elasticity coefficients indicated that one percent increase in amount put to un-productive purposes increased the overdues by $1.45 \%$ and $1 \%$ increase in old debts increased the overdues by $0.31 \%$.

Among all the explanatory variables, only three explanatory variables significantly affected the overdues of semi-medium farmer defaulters. The regression coefficients of the selected three explanatory variables, i.e., gross farm income ( $\mathrm{X}_{1}=-0.01$ ), amount borrowed $\left(\mathrm{X}_{3}=0.15\right)$ and amount put to un-productive purposes $\left(\mathrm{X}_{7}=0.25\right)$ were found to be statistically significant at $10 \%$ level of significance. Out of these, amount borrowed $\left(\mathrm{X}_{3}\right)$ and amount put to un-productive purposes $\left(\mathrm{X}_{7}\right)$ had significantly positive relationship while gross farm income $\left(\mathrm{X}_{1}\right)$ had significantly negative relationship with the amount of overdues. These three explanatory variables together accounted for $94.55 \%$ of the variation in overdues. The elasticity coefficients indicated that one per cent increase in gross farm income decreased the overdues by $1.26 \%$ and one per cent increase in each of amount borrowed and amount put to unproductive purposes increased the overdues by $2.35 \%$ and $1.17 \%$ in that order.

The regression results revealed that only four explanatory variables namely; gross farm income ( $\mathrm{X}_{1}$ ), amount borrowed $\left(\mathrm{X}_{3}\right)$, expenditures on family consumption ( $\mathrm{X}_{8}$ ) and old debts $\left(\mathrm{X}_{11}\right)$ significantly affected the overdues of medium cum large category of farmer defaulters. The regression coefficient of gross farm income ( $\mathrm{X}_{1}=-0.07$ ) was estimated to be negative and significant at $5 \%$ level of significance. And, on the other hand, that of amount borrowed $\left(\mathrm{X}_{3}=0.10\right)$ and old debts $\left(\mathrm{X}_{11}=0.50\right)$ were positive and significant at $1 \%$ level of significance. expenditures on family consumption ( $\mathrm{X}_{8}=$ 0.10 ), too, was positive and significant but at $10 \%$ level of significance. The coefficient of determination $\left(\mathrm{R}^{2}\right)$ was 0.7851 indicating that $78.51 \%$ of variation in overdues was explained by the explanatory
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variables included in the model. The elasticity coefficients indicated that $1 \%$ increase in gross farm income decreased the overdues by $2.74 \%$. On the contrary, $1 \%$ increase in each of amount borrowed, expenditures on family consumption and old debts increased the overdues by $3.04 \%, 0.66 \%$ and $0.62 \%$, respectively.

Table 7: Estimated multiple linear production function for the farmer defaulters

| S.No. Explanatory variables / Size groups | Regression coefficients | Standard Error | VIF | Elasticity coefficients |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Marginal farmer defaulters ( $\mathbf{R}^{\mathbf{2}=.84 \text { ) }}$ |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Intercept (a) | 4868.16 | 1258.59 | - | - |
| 2. Non-farm income ( $\mathrm{X}_{2}$ ) | -0.12** | 0.04 | 1.13 | -0.86 |
| 3. Old debts ( $\mathrm{X}_{11}$ ) | 0.18*** | 0.03 | 1.13 | 2.52 |
| Small farmer defaulters ( $\mathbf{R}^{\mathbf{2}=.86 \text { ) }}$ |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Intercept (a) | 4709.16 | 2694.35 | - | - |
| 2. Amount put to un-productive purposes ( $\mathrm{X}_{7}$ ) | 0.27*** | 0.04 | 1.44 | 1.45 |
| 3. Old debts $\left(\mathrm{X}_{11}\right)$ | 0.21* | 0.09 | 1.44 | 0.31 |
| Semi-medium farmer defaulters ( $\mathbf{R}^{2}=.95$ ) |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Intercept (a) | 15191.96 | 10816.22 | - | - |
| 2. Gross farm income ( $\mathrm{X}_{1}$ ) | -0.01* | 0.05 | 1.07 | -1.26 |
| 3. Amount borrowed ( $\mathrm{X}_{3}$ ) | 0.15* | 0.05 | 7.27 | 2.35 |
| 4. Amount put to un- productive purposes ( $\mathrm{X}_{7}$ ) | 0.25* | 0.09 | 7.34 | 1.17 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Intercept (a) | 12635.04 | 11439.72 | - | - |
| 2. Amount borrowed ( $\mathrm{X}_{3}$ ) | 0.08** | 0.02 | 1.38 | 2.65 |
| 3. Cropping intensity $\left(\mathrm{X}_{5}\right)$ | -0.31* | 0.14 | 1.12 | -0.42 |
| 4. Old debts $\left(\mathrm{X}_{11}\right)$ | 0.48** | 0.13 | 1.37 | 0.58 |
| Medium cum large farmer defaulters ( $\mathbf{R}^{\mathbf{2}=.79 \text { ) }}$ |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Intercept (a) | 1909.35 | 7678.31 | - | - |
| 2. Gross farm income ( $\mathrm{X}_{1}$ ) | -0.07** | 0.02 | 1.35 | -2.74 |
| 3. Amount borrowed ( $\mathrm{X}_{3}$ ) | 0.10*** | 0.02 | 1.60 | 3.04 |
| 4. Expenditures on family consumption $\left(\mathrm{X}_{8}\right)$ | 0.10* | 0.05 | 1.54 | 0.66 |
| 5. Old debts $\left(\mathrm{X}_{11}\right)$ | 0.50*** | 0.11 | 1.59 | 0.62 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Intercept (a) | -3129.46 | 2517.79 | - | - |
| 2. Gross farm income ( $\mathrm{X}_{1}$ ) | -0.05*** | 0.01 | 1.91 | -2.58 |
| 3. Amount borrowed ( $\mathrm{X}_{3}$ ) | 0.13*** | 0.01 | 2.07 | 3.87 |
| 4. Expenditures on family consumption $\left(\mathrm{X}_{8}\right)$ | 0.10** | 0.04 | 1.93 | 0.66 |
| 5. Old debts $\left(\mathrm{X}_{11}\right)$ | 0.33*** | 0.06 | 1.73 | 0.56 |

*** significant at $1 \%$ level of significance
** significant at $5 \%$ level of significance

* significant at $10 \%$ level of significance

The regression results for aggregate or pooled farmer defaulters indicated that the gross farm income ( $\mathrm{X}_{1}=-0.05$ ), amount borrowed $\left(\mathrm{X}_{3}=0.13\right)$, expenditures on family consumption $\left(\mathrm{X}_{8}=0.10\right)$ and old debts $\left(X_{11}=0.33\right)$ had significant influence on the amount of overdues. The results indicated that the gross farm income $\left(\mathrm{X}_{1}\right)$ was significantly negative at $1 \%$ level of significance. amount borrowed $\left(\mathrm{X}_{3}\right)$ and old debts $\left(\mathrm{X}_{11}\right)$ were significantly positive at $1 \%$ level of significance and expenditures on family consumption $\left(\mathrm{X}_{8}\right)$ was also significantly positive at $5 \%$ level of significance. These four explanatory variables together accounted for $81.15 \%$ of variation in overdues. The elasticity coefficients showed that $1 \%$ increase in gross farm income decreased the overdues by $2.58 \%$ and $1 \%$ increase each in the amount borrowed, expenditures on family consumption and old debts increased the overdues by 3.87, 0.66 and $0.56 \%$, respectively.
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