



## Research Article

# KNOWLEDGE OF RURAL POOR (BENEFICIARIES) ABOUT DIFFERENT ACTIVITIES OF IRDP (INTEGRATED RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME) IN BANASKANTHA DISTRICT OF GUJARAT STATE

PARMAR ILA<sup>1\*</sup>, VIHOL D.P.<sup>2</sup>, PRAJAPATI MAYUR<sup>3</sup> AND THAKKAR K.A.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Aspee College of Home science & Nutrition, S. D. Agricultural University, Sardarkrushinagar, 385 506, Banaskantha, Gujarat

<sup>2</sup>Department of Homescience Extension and Communication Management, Aspee College of Homescience& Nutrition, S.D. Agricultural University Sardarkrushinagar, 385 506, Banaskantha, Gujarat

<sup>3,4</sup>Department of Extension Education, C.P. College of Agriculture, S.D. Agricultural University, Sardarkrushinagar, 385 506, Banaskantha, Gujarat

\*Corresponding Author: Email- ilaparmar88@gmail.com, mayurext@gmail.com

Received: September 21, 2016; Revised: July 21, 2017; Accepted: July 22, 2017; Published: August 18, 2017

**Abstract-** Integrated approach of rural development is adopted by the government of India as a resource and income development programme at all India level through 5011 blocks. Main objective has been to provide gainful employment and to remove poverty in rural area by increasing income of families living below poverty line. The present study was conducted in district rural development agency area in palanpur taluka was selected purposefully and the villages and respondents were selected randomly. The total size of the respondents was 1200. The respondents were interviewed personally with the help of interview schedule. To assess the knowledge, utilization pattern, opinion and suggestions certain sets of questions were asked to the respondents. After that, the data were analyzed with the help of Statistical tools. Majority of the respondents had average knowledge about IRDA activities.

**Keywords-** IRDP, TRYSEM

**Citation:** Parmar Ila, et al., (2017) Knowledge of Rural Poor (Beneficiaries) about Different Activities of IRDP (Integrated Rural Development Programme) in Banaskantha District of Gujarat State. International Journal of Agriculture Sciences, ISSN: 0975-3710 & E-ISSN: 0975-9107, Volume 9, Issue 38, pp.-4571-4573.

**Copyright:** Copyright©2017 Parmar Ila, et al., This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

**Academic Editor / Reviewer:** Dr R.D. Dhandhukia, Rakeshkumar Naranbhai Patel

## Introduction

The IRDP which is a key alleviation programme and aims at raising the poverty line, will be implemented with a greater vigor. The target of additional beneficiaries to be covered under the programme during 1983-84 is 3 million. An effort will be made to ensure that at least 30.00 per cent of the beneficiaries are from the category of scheduled castes and scheduled tribes (Anon., 1983). IRDP is the positive response to the national concern for the rural poor in which development is the objective, integration the method and rural the focus. IRDP is basically a development oriented programme, with the primary objective of integration of positive factors available at present and integration of positive factors available at present and that can be made available to bear on individuals, groups and community. It will include credit and services, institutional arrangements facilitating different inputs to be made available at one point, consolidation efforts, activities, programmes and investments etc. of the different institutions voluntary or statutory to be coordinated as ingredients of a common 'Development Programme'. In the process of integration, the 'Linkages' which are absent or dormant are proposed to be review, provided or created. The IRDP is specially aimed at assisting the weakest among the minimum coverage of SC/ST families is expected to be 30.00 per cent (20.00 per cent for SC and 10.00 per cent for ST) [1].

Knowledge is that part of person's information which is in accordance with the established facts. For the present study, it refers to the information possessed by the beneficiaries regarding different activities in accordance with facilities provided by agency (IRDA). If there is no flow of information to increase knowledge of farmers or artisans, the activity will remain static [2]. The farmers or artisans may be illiterate, but they are intelligent. Their wisdom is born of centuries struggle for existence under harsh conditions centered around farming or

artisanship. The knowledge passed from generation to generation take a form of customs and traditions deeply ingrained in their culture. So, whatever information is passed on to them, it should be such as to fit in their frame of reference. If the information does not correspond to their built-in value, it may be discarded without even a trial. The knowledge of beneficiaries about different activities as perceived by them was reviewed from available related literature [3].

## Objective

- (1) To assess the knowledge of beneficiaries about different activities of Integrated Rural Development Programme (IRDP).

## Methodology

The present study was conducted in District Rural Development Agency area of palanpur taluka of Banaskantha district of Gujarat state. The palanpur taluka was selected purposefully and the respondents were selected randomly from ten randomly selected villages. The total size of the respondents was 100. The respondents were interviewed personally with help of interview schedule. In order to assess the knowledge, utilization pattern, opinion and suggestions certain sets of questions were asked to the respondents. After the completion of the work for data collection the data collected were grouped in tables into the master sheets. After that the data were analyzed with the help of percentage, scores, mean score, chi-square rank correlation and 'F' test according to the nature of the data.

## Result and Discussions

The knowledge of the beneficiaries about different activities is an indication of the degree to which they have tried to seek information regarding different aspects of

getting facilities. Here, it refers to the information possessed by the respondents about different activities in accordance with the facilities provided by IRDA. The assessment of knowledge is classified in the following heads and presented in [Tables-1, 2, and 3].

### (I) Awareness about different activities

The ultimate objective of providing facilities in different activities as incentives is to convince the beneficiaries to utilize the facilities for their own benefits. The awareness is related to the progressiveness of the respondents with respect to different activities.

Table-1 Distribution of the respondents according to their awareness about different activities of IRD (n = 100)

Sr. No.	Activity	Awareness		Rank
		No.	Per cent	
1	Agricultural development activities	49	49.00	III
2	A.H. and dairy development activities	75	75.00	I
3	Self employment activities	66	66.00	II
4	Cottage industries	41	41.00	IV
5	Trysem	8	8.00	V

The data presented in [Table-1] indicate, that majority (75.00 per cent) were aware with the A.H. and dairy development activities, while 66.00 per cent, 49.00 per cent, 41.00 per cent and 8.00 per cent respondents were aware with self employment activities, agricultural development activities, cottage industries and TRYSEM respectively. According to ranking A.H. and dairy development activities secured first, self employment activities second, agricultural development activities third cottage industries fourth and TRYSEM fifth rank regarding awareness about different activities of IRDA.

The probable reason is that the majority of the respondents were aware with the A. H. and dairy development activities and self-employment activities might be due to their more utilization of those facilities. Few respondents were least aware of the agricultural development and cottage industries activities because they do not possess the land for agriculture and they do not require such facilities so they have not observed it properly. Figure 3 gives an idea about the awareness about activities of IRDA.

### (II) Knowledge levels in different activities

Table-2 Distribution of respondents with respect to their level of knowledge regarding different activities (n = 100)

Sr. No.	Activity	Category	Distribution		Mean Score	Rank
			No.	Per cent		
1	Agricultural development activities	Good	16	16.00	2.3	III
		Fair	46	46.00		
		Poor	38	38.00		
2	A.H. and dairy development activities	Good	22	22.00	5.1	I
		Fair	72	72.00		
		Poor	6	6.00		
3	Self employment activities	Good	26	26.00	3.25	II
		Fair	40	40.00		
		Poor	34	34.00		
4	Cottage industries	Good	26	26.00	2.22	IV
		Fair	37	37.00		
		Poor	37	37.00		
5	Trysem	Good	19	19.00	1.93	V
		Fair	25	25.00		
		Poor	56	56.00		

The data presented in [Table-2] with respect to the knowledge levels and mean scores of the respondents in different activities were converted into comparable form. The data clearly reveal that out of total 100 respondents, 46 (46.00 per cent) had fair, 38 respondents (38.00 per cent) had poor and only 16 respondents

(16.00 per cent) had good level of knowledge regarding the agricultural development activities. The data further show that out of 100 respondents 72 (72.00 per cent) had fair, 22 respondents (22.00 per cent) had good and 6 respondents (6.00 per cent) had poor knowledge level regarding A.H. and dairy development activities. In case of self-employment activities 40 (40.00 per cent) had fair while 34 and 26 (34.00 and 26.00 per cent respondents) respondents had poor and good level of knowledge respectively. As far as the cottage industries are concerned 37 (37.00 per cent) respondents had fair and 26 (26.00 per cent) respondents had good level of knowledge. About trysem more than half (56.00 per cent) had poor 25 (25.00 per cent) had fair and 19 (19.00 per cent) had good level of knowledge. The converted mean scores indicated that the respondents had more knowledge about A.H. and dairy development activities followed by self-employment activities agricultural development activities, cottage industries and poorest is the trysem.

The probable reason for different levels of knowledge might be due to some socio-economical and psychological factors. The findings of above Table is similar to those reported by Nachiappan and Srinivasmurthy (1977) and Dakh (1976) who stated that dairy loan participants possess knowledge practices [4,5]. They also stated the small farmers had full knowledge about sanction of loans to purchase improved seeds and fertilizers.

Table-3 Distribution of respondents according to their overall knowledge about Different activities (n = 100)

Category	Score range	Distribution		Score range	
		No.	Per cent	Expected	Observed
Good	Above 20	15	15.00	0-50	4-37
Fair	17 to 20	56	56.00		
Poor	Below 17	29	29.00		

The data presented in [Table-3] clearly indicate that than half (56.00 per cent) respondents had fair, respondents (29.00 per cent) had poor and 15 respondents (15.00 per cent) had good level of knowledge regarding the different activities. The expected range score was 0-50, but minimum and maximum score observed range between 4-37 with mean score of 17.85, standard deviation of 8.57. The data show that mean score was less than 50 per cent none of the respondents had secured more than 37 scores. The variation within the groups was high. So it can be said that majority of the respondents had fair (average) knowledge of IRDA activities. The probable reason for their average knowledge might be due to their illiteracy or low level of education, which do not enable them to receive and apply the information according to their needs.

### Conclusion

From the above research study, it could be concluded that the study of IRDP regarding awareness and knowledge that Agricultural development activities and Animal husbandry and dairy development activities had higher preference from the farmers. Secondly the major part that the person works in one field (i.e. cobler) might not have interest in other (i.e. agricultural) activities.

**Acknowledgement / Funding:** Author are thankful to Aspee College of Home science & Nutrition, S. D. Agricultural University, Sardarkrushinagar, 385 506, Banaskantha, Gujarat

### Author Contributions:

1. Ila Parmar: Technical contribution (For Survey Help)
2. D. P. Vihol: Main Research Work done by Him.
3. Mayur Prajapati: Technical Contribution (For Preparation & Engagement of Research Work)
4. K. A. Thakkar: Technically & Scientific Support for Research

### Abbreviations:

IRDP: Integrated Rural Development Program  
TRYSEM: Training of Rural Youth for Self-Employment

**Conflict of Interest:** None declared

## References

- [1] Muthayya B.C., Naidu K.K. and Aneesudin A. (1983) *Journal of Rural Development*, 2(3), 322-349.
- [2] Anand S. K. (1983) Study on the implementation of IRDP under the new 20 points economic programme in the district of Dehradun." *Co-operative Perspective*, 18 (i), 6.
- [3] Desai V. (1983) *A study of Rural Economics*, Himalaya Publishing House, Mumbai, 1st Edition (T.B)
- [4] Nachippan P.R. and Jage Srivasanmurthy (1977) *Indian Journal of Extension Education*, XIII (3 and 4), 68.
- [5] Dakh A.M. (1975-76) Impact of SFDA on small farmers, Agresco Report, Marathawada Agril. University, Parbhani, (M.S.), 78.