Raj. J. Extn. Edu. 17 & 18 : 203-206, 2009 & 2010

INNOVATIVE EXTENSION STRATEGY OF TECHNOLOGY APPLICATION IN SHGs THROUGH IKP FOR AGRI-RURAL DEVELOPMENT

T. Saidanna* and A. Sailaja**

ABSTRACT

Achievement of sustainable livelihood is a broad goal of poverty eradication. To achieve one of the Millennium Development Goals of poverty eradication by 2015, Government of Andhra Pradesh has been implementing Indira Kranthi Patham (IKP). a largest poverty alleviation project through a registered society. This society is for elimination of rural poverty' (SERP) (Governmental NGO) under Department of Rural Development routed through DRDA.

Under this project, social aspects like institution building, human resource building, sustainable livelihoods have been studied in four villages randomly selected from two mandals of Mahaboobnagar district of Andhra Pradesh. Results revealed that majority of respondents had medium institution building (TB), human resource capacity building (HRCB) and medium sustainable livelihoods (SL). A multi-pronged strategy needs to be followed to eliminate the poverty. Not only economical base is important, but agriculture, water, health and education should also be considered in mind. Community mobilization and participation in running the project successfully is key for the success of developmental programme.

INTRODUCTION

Human development index of any nation is directly linked with literacy. Women are the torch bearers of social change of which education is the key instrument and has direct link with poverty. Lack of education, training and low level of literacy excluded her from social, political, economic and knowledge power also. Hence, Government of Andhra Pradesh is implementing a largest poverty alleviation project named Indira Kranti Patham' (IKP) which is implemented by a registered society. This society is for elimination of Rural Poverty' (SERP) under Department of Rural Development. The main focus of this project is on livelihood component of women self help groups (SHGs) of below poverty line families, wherein it uses SHG model to address the broader issues rural poverty. In this context. SERP initiated to work on agribased livelihoods supporting them to adopt sustainable agricultural practices reduce the cost of cultivation and thereby build sustainable, self reliant and self managed institutions of the poor women. The main objective of this project is to enable poorest of the poor to improve their livelihood and quality of life. With this background in view, an attempt was made to study only few components of IKP such as their perception towards social aspects (institution building, human resource capacity building and sustainable livelihoods) in four villages randomly selected from two mandals of Mahaboobnagar district of Andhra Pradesh.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Thirty women belonging to two groups were selected at random from each of the selected villages (4) and thus one hundred and twenty respondents of eight groups formed the sample for the study. Schedules were developed to measure the perception of farm women towards institution building and human resource capacity building

* P.G. Student, Department of Agricultural Extension, College of Agriculture, Acharya N.G. Ranga Agricultural University, Rajendranagar, Hydrabad.

** Associate Professor, Department of Agricultural Extension, College of Agriculture, Acharya N.G. Ranga Agricultural University, Rajendranagar, Hydrabad.

Table 1. Distribution of respondents based on their perception towards social aspects of Indira Kranthi Patham

(n=120)

S. No.	Items	Categories / Frequencies		
		Low	Medium	High
1.	Institution building	30 (25.00)	56 (46.67)	34 (28.33)
2.	Human resource capacity building	38 (31.60)	60 (50.00)	22 (18.40)
3.	Sustainable livelihoods	29 (34.20)	53 (44.20)	38 (31.60)
a.	Human capital	31 (35.83)	49 (40.83)	40 (33.34)
b.	Physical capital	34 (28.30)	59 (49.16)	27 (22.54)
c.	Natural capital	46 (38.30)	39 (32.56)	35 (29.20)
d.	Social capital	36 (30.00)	50 (41.60)	34 (28.40)
e.	Financial capital	57 (47.50)	32 (26.67)	31 (25.84)

Figures in parentheses indicate percentages

while index developed by Krishna Prasad (2005) was used to measure sustainable livelihoods.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

It is clear from Table 1 that the majority of respondents (46.67%) had felt the need for institution building at medium level, possessed medium level (50.00%) of human resource capacity building and had medium sustainable livelihoods (44.20%) with medium human (40.83%), physical (49.16%) and social capitals (41.60%) low natural (38.30%) and financial capitals (47.50%) respectively.

It is evident from Table 1 that majority of respondents (46.67%) perceived medium level of institution building as the groups were heterogenous with diverse interests. Majority of respondents (50.00%) perceived medium level of human resource capacity building as they could not realize the feasibility of the agricultural practices in the present agricultural scenario and could not understand the significance of sustainable agriculture in the maintenance of ecological balance during their orientation to the programme.

In accordance with Table 1. majority of respondents (44.20%) were in medium sustainable livelihoods as they were unable to get employment in a livelihood for a longer period of time. Moreover, they could not afford to procure human, physical, natural, social and financial capitals. Thus funding is in line with that of Krishna Prasad (2005).

The data from Table 2 revealed that majority (40.83%) of the respondents had medium human capital as they did not have school education and had average health and labour facilities. This finding is in tune with that of Reddy (2003). It is also clear from Table 2 that majority (49.16 %), had medium physical capital as there were no interventions introduced to improve their physical capital. Low natural capital in the area was due to rainfed farming, monocropping and absence of farming systems approach in the area. The finding is in conformity with that of Krishna Prasad (2005). Low socio-political participation of the respondents led to low social capital. As the majority of the respondents had high indebtedness and lower savings, they possessed low financial capital.

CONCLUSION

It can be concluded that Community Coordinators (CC) of TKP needs to take up participatory planning exercises in order to build sound institutions of rural poor comprised of homogeneity and common interests and thus form Common Interest Groups (CIGs). SERP needs to hire development professionals from agriculture and other allied universities to conduct experiential and skill oriented participatory training sessions to IKP staff (APMS) after Participatory Training Need Assessment (PTNA) of self help groups. This results in formation of role SHG models showcasing different technologies at village level viz., biofertilizer, biopesticide, seed production etc. This also facilitates in sharing of resources at village level reducing external input dependence in agriculture

Table 2. Item analysis of indicators of livelihood components (n=120)

S. No.	Items	Categories / Frequencies		
		Poor (P)	Average (A)	Good (G)
I. Human capital				
	a. Health	35 (22.16)	60 (50.00)	25 (20.84)
		No school	FL	PS
	b. Education	57 (47.50)	44 (36.60)	16 (13.33)
		P	A	G
	c. Labour availability	20 (16.60)	65 (54.16)	35 (29.24)
II. Physical capital				
	a. Affordable transport	34 (28.34)	55 (45.83)	31 (25.83)
		Kachha	Pakka	Tiled
	b. Type of house	60 (50.00)	49 (90.83)	11 (09.17)
		P	A	G
	c. Adequacy of water supply	50 (41.60)	40 (33.30)	30 (25.10)
		Firewood	Kerosene	LPG
	d. Source of energy for hosuehold / domestic purpose	74 (61.60)	30 (25.00)	16 (13.40)
		Neighbours	Local Leaders	
	e. Information sources	46 (38.30)	36 (30.04)	
		None	1 animal	2 animals
	f. Material possession	30 (25.00)	54 (45.00)	36 (30.00)
III. Natural capital				
		Dry	Wet	
	a. Land type	90 (75.00)	30 (25.00)	
		Chalka	Red	
	b. Soil type	50 (41.67)	30 (25.02)	
		Canals	Tube wells	Tanks
	c. Irrigation facilities	25 (20.80)	20 (16.60)	70 (58.30)
		Rainfed	Irrigated	Irrigated dry
	d. Cultivation type	60 (50.00)	45 (37.50)	15 (12.50)
		Oil seeds	Cereals	Pulses
	e. Crop type	50 (41.67)	40 (33.33)	20 (16.67)
		Mono-cropping	Double cropping	
	f. Cropping systems	100 (83.33)	20 (16.67)	
		Crop-Crop	Crop-Dairy	
	g. Farming systems	120 (100.00)	90 (75.00)	
		Buffaloes		
	h. Livestock composition	90 (75.00)		
IV. Social capital				
		Low	Medium	High
	a. Socio-political participation	90 (66.67)	30 (25.11)	10 (08.33)
	b. Trust and solidarity	25 (20.83)	50 (41.67)	45 (37.51)
	c. Extent of trust	20 (16.67)	75 (62.50)	25 (20.84)
V. Financial capital				
	a. Indebtedness	20 (16.67)	40 (33.34)	60 (50.00)
	b. Savings	60 (50.00)	25 (20.83)	35 (29.17)

FL – Functional literate PS – Primary School BC – Bullock cart PT – Public transport

besides securing livelihoods. SERP in coordination approach with NREGS needs to take up agricultural activities viz., desilting of tasks, afforestration programmes. In order to strengthen various indicators of sustainable livelihoods the following are suggested.

REFERENCES

Prasad Krishna T 2005 A study on rural poverty and sustainable livelihoods in agrarian sector of Andhra Pradesh. Ph.D. Thesis, Acharya N.G. Ranga Agricultural University, Hyderabad.

Reddy R S 2003 A study on knowledge and farming performance of tomato farmers in Chittoor district of Andhra Pradesh. M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis, Acharya N.G. Ranga Agricultural University, Hyderabad.

Satpathy C and Ghadei K 2009 Sustainable livelihood approach A tool of poverty reduction. Journal of Extension Education 4(1 &2) : 11-21.

❐❐❐