



E-ISSN: 2278-4136

P-ISSN: 2349-8234

[www.phytojournal.com](http://www.phytojournal.com)

JPP 2020; 9(6): 1825-1827

Received: 19-09-2020

Accepted: 21-10-2020

**Jeetendra Patel**

PG Student Department of  
Extension Education JNKVV,  
College of Agriculture,  
Tikamgarh, M. P., India

**Kamini Bisht**

JNKVV, College of Agriculture,  
Tikamgarh, Madhya Pradesh,  
India

**SP Singh**

JNKVV, College of Agriculture,  
Tikamgarh, Madhya Pradesh,  
India

**Sheela Raghuvanshi**

JNKVV, College of Agriculture,  
Tikamgarh, Madhya Pradesh,  
India

**Corresponding Author:****Jeetendra Patel**

PG Student Department of  
Extension Education JNKVV,  
College of Agriculture,  
Tikamgarh, M. P., India

## Factors contributing to sustainable livelihood of SGSY beneficiaries

Jeetendra Patel, Kamini Bisht, SP Singh and Sheela Raghuvanshi

**Abstract**

The study was carried out in Tikamgarh block of Tikamgarh district to analyze factors influencing sustainable livelihood of SGSY beneficiaries. Total 120 SGSY beneficiaries undertaken dairying as income generating activities were selected from 10 villages using simple random sampling method. Data was collected with the aid of structured interview schedule and analyzed using descriptive statistical tools namely; mean, frequency, percentages and correlation coefficient. The findings of the study shows that variables education, land holding, social participation, achievement motivation and source of information were found to be positive and significantly associated with sustainable livelihood of SGSY beneficiaries, the extension agencies should therefore, aim at manipulating these variables to their advantage for promoting income generating activities in rural areas.

**Keywords:** sustainable, livelihood, SGSY beneficiaries

**Introduction**

The Indian government has made poverty a priority in its development planning by increasing self and wage employment. Hence the new government strategies for alleviation of rural poverty are focused at people's participation, building human capital and group approach. The government of India had launched "Swarna Jayanti Gram Swarozgar Yojana (SGSY)" which had its effect from April 1, 1999 and emerged as the main programme for promoting poverty alleviation through self-employment. SGSY has undertaken livelihood development programme through income generating activities for rural people. SGSY particularly focuses on the vulnerable groups among the rural poor. The SC/ST people account for at least 50 per cent of the swarozgaries, women for 40 per cent and the disabled for 3 per cent. Swarna Jayanti Gram Swarozgar Yojana is a centrally sponsored scheme and the financing of the programme is shared between the Center and the State in the ratio 75:25. The aim of the scheme is to cover 30 per cent of below poverty line families from each block with the objective of bringing them above poverty line within span of three years by increasing their monthly income at least in the 3<sup>rd</sup> year the net income should be more than Rs.2,000/- per month.

Livelihood activities according to Ellis (1999) [5] are the activities, assets and the access that jointly determine the living gained by the rural households. Carney (1998) [3] explains that it is sustainable when it has the capacity to meet the immediate needs of the people while its ability to meet future needs is not jeopardized. To implement appropriate support strategies, there is need for valid and reliable information about the factors that enhance or hinder the sustainable livelihood of rural households. Therefore, the present study on "Factors contributing to sustainable livelihood of SGSY beneficiaries" was carried out.

**Material and Methods**

The study was conducted in Tikamgarh block of Tikamgarh district of Madhya Pradesh. Tikamgarh block was selected purposively for the study because of having highest number of SGSY beneficiaries as compared to other blocks. From the selected block ten villages were selected for the investigation purpose. The village selection was based on the criteria of number of respondents undertaken dairying as income generating activities besides agriculture. Thus total 120 respondents from ten villages undertaking dairying as income generating activity under SGSY were selected.

**Results and Discussion****1. Factors affecting sustainable livelihood of SGSY beneficiaries**

It is clear from the results (Table 1) that out of thirteen variables regarding socio-economic, communication and psychological variables, five variables *viz.* education, land holding, social participation, achievement motivation, and source of information were found to be significantly

related with overall sustainable livelihood of SGSY beneficiaries, whereas age, annual income, family size, innovativeness, risk bearing ability, economic motivation and mass-media exposure had showed non- significant association with overall sustainable livelihood of SGSY respondents. As indicated by correlation coefficient values, education had significant relationship at 1 per cent level of probability with human capital and 5 per cent level of probability with social capital and food security. Annual income was found to have significant relationship with financial capital at 1 per cent level of probability. The variable land holding had significant

relationship with human capital, physical capital and food security at 5 per cent level of probability. Social participation has significant relationship with human and social capital at 5 per cent level of probability and with physical capital at 1 per cent level of probability. Achievement motivation had significant relationship at 5 per cent level of probability with physical and human capital. Mass media exposure was found to have significant relationship with food security at 5 per cent level of probability whereas source of information had significant relationship with financial capital and food security at 5 per cent level of probability.

**Table 1:** Relationship of independent variables with various dimensions of capital improvement

Variable	Human	Physical	Social	Financial	Food	Over all
Age	-0.086 <sup>NS</sup>	-0.012 <sup>NS</sup>	-0.112 <sup>NS</sup>	0.146 <sup>NS</sup>	-0.005 <sup>NS</sup>	-0.074 <sup>NS</sup>
Education	0.154**	0.099 <sup>NS</sup>	0.226*	-0.148 <sup>NS</sup>	0.221*	0.200*
Annual income	-0.035 <sup>NS</sup>	-0.040 <sup>NS</sup>	0.052 <sup>NS</sup>	0.162**	0.125 <sup>NS</sup>	0.107 <sup>NS</sup>
Family size	-0.046 <sup>NS</sup>	0.051 <sup>NS</sup>	-0.109 <sup>NS</sup>	0.106 <sup>NS</sup>	-0.009 <sup>NS</sup>	-0.052 <sup>NS</sup>
Land holding	0.230*	0.464*	0.073 <sup>NS</sup>	0.113 <sup>NS</sup>	0.330*	0.259*
Social participation	0.221*	0.165**	0.194*	-0.049 <sup>NS</sup>	0.184	0.266*
Innovativeness	-0.043 <sup>NS</sup>	0.073 <sup>NS</sup>	0.0099 <sup>NS</sup>	-0.076 <sup>NS</sup>	0.060 <sup>NS</sup>	0.027 <sup>NS</sup>
Risk bearing ability	-0.163 <sup>NS</sup>	-0.155 <sup>NS</sup>	0.0004 <sup>NS</sup>	0.047 <sup>NS</sup>	0.024 <sup>NS</sup>	-0.040 <sup>NS</sup>
Economic motivation	0.0014 <sup>NS</sup>	-0.233 <sup>NS</sup>	0.117 <sup>NS</sup>	0.081 <sup>NS</sup>	0.118 <sup>NS</sup>	0.011 <sup>NS</sup>
Achievement motivation	0.225*	0.187*	0.148 <sup>NS</sup>	0.008 <sup>NS</sup>	0.075 <sup>NS</sup>	0.212*
Mass-media exposure	0.023 <sup>NS</sup>	0.024 <sup>NS</sup>	0.140 <sup>NS</sup>	0.022 <sup>NS</sup>	0.214*	0.141 <sup>NS</sup>
Source of information	0.104 <sup>NS</sup>	-0.0534 <sup>NS</sup>	0.136 <sup>NS</sup>	0.209*	0.266*	0.252*

\*Significant at 5%

\*\*Significant at 1%

NS-Non significant

The education of the SGSY respondents had shown significant association with overall sustainable livelihood. The works of Arunkumar (2004)<sup>[1]</sup> support this finding. The association between land holding and overall sustainable livelihood was found to be significant. The finding was in conformity with the finding of Devalatha (2005)<sup>[4]</sup>. The variable social participation exhibited significant association with overall sustainable livelihood. The data indicated that achievement motivation had significant association with overall sustainable livelihood. This finding is supported by Biradar (2008)<sup>[2]</sup>. The study indicated that source of information had significant association with overall sustainable livelihood. The works of Sonawane *et al.* (2001)<sup>[6]</sup> support this finding.

## 2. Constraints and opinion of respondents in sustaining rural livelihood

Table 2 depicts distribution of respondents based on constraints expressed in sustaining rural livelihood. The respondents expressed lack of the transportation facilities (85.83%), susceptibility of animals to diseases (80.83%), Lack of veterinary facilities in the village (79.17%), Improper supply of electricity (72.50%), Lack of hospital facilities (53.33%), Lack of trainings on skilled work performance (48.33%), Problem of marketing product (44.17%) and Difficult bank loan procedure (34.17%) are some of the constraints as mentioned by the respondents.

**Table 2:** Constraints faced by respondents in sustaining rural livelihood

S. No.	Constraints	Frequency	Percentage
1	Lack of transportation facilities	103	85.83
2	Susceptibility of animals to diseases	97	80.83
3	Lack of veterinary facilities in the village	95	79.17
4	Improper supply of electricity	87	72.50
5	Lack of hospital and school facilities	64	53.33
6	Lack of trainings on skilled work performance	58	48.33
7	Problem of marketing product	52	44.17
8	Difficult bank loan procedure	41	34.17

The information presented in Table3 indicated the opinion given by respondents for improving their livelihood. It was revealed from the table that majority (84.17%) of the respondents suggested to improve the transportation facilities to the villages followed by 81.67 per cent of the respondents suggested to have more encouragement from the government

to undertake livelihood development projects in rural areas. Further, 78.33 per cent respondents opined to provide veterinary facilities in the village followed by sufficient supply of electricity to villages (61.67%), construction of hospitals and school (56.67%), and to simplify the bank loan procedures (52.50%).

**Table 3:** Opinion of respondents in sustaining rural livelihood

S. No.	Opinion	Frequency	Percentage
1	Transportation facility should be improved	101	84.17
2	More encouragement from the government to undertake livelihood development projects in rural areas	98	81.67
3	Veterinary facilities should be provided in the village	94	78.33
4	Sufficient supply of electricity to villages	74	61.67
5	Construction of hospitals and school	68	56.67
6	Procedure for loan should be simplified	63	52.50

### Conclusion

The finding of the study shows that certain variables shown positive significant relationship with improvement of various dimensions of capitals, so the extension agencies should aim at manipulating these variables to their advantage for promoting income generating activities in rural area. Proper and structural livestock funding policy with training on livestock management by the bank, NGOs and other development agencies would encourage to take livestock activities for generating additional income. There are number of suggestions suggested by the beneficiaries, such as, to improve the transportation facilities to the villages, more encouragement from the government to undertake livelihood development projects in rural areas, veterinary facilities in the village, sufficient supply of electricity to villages, construction of hospitals and school and to simplify the bank loan procedures. These suggestions should be kept in mind before formulating the projects for rural beneficiaries.

### References

1. Arunkumar TD. Profile of SHGs and their contribution for livestock development in Karnataka. M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis, UAS, Dharwad 2004.
2. Biradar BN. A study on impact of income generating activities on sustainable rural livelihoods of KAWAD project beneficiaries in Karnataka. M.Sc. (Agri.) Thesis, UAS, Dharwad 2008.
3. Carney D. Sustainable rural livelihoods: what contribution can we make? Conference proceedings of the International Development's National Resources advisers' conference 1998, 428.
4. Devalatha CM. Profile study of women SHGs in Gadag district of northern Karnataka. M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis, UAS, Dharwad 2005.
5. Ellis F. Rural Livelihood Diversity in Developing Countries: Evidence and Policy Implications. Natural Resource Perspectives No. 40. Overseas Development Institute 1999.
6. Sonawane SD, Chikhalikar PJ, Nirban AJ. Utilization of communication sources by the farmers for seeking farm information. Maharashtra J Extn. Edu 2001;10:61-62.