CHAPTER 2

METHODOLOGY PLAN AND BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

2.1. Conceptual Framework

In India, majority of the population live in villages and their main occupation is agriculture and allied activities, which is the uncertainty to the livelihood security to the rural poor. Rural livelihood focuses on the strategies and approaches for the promotion of living standard of rural people, which emphasiss the basis for survival of rural people. According to the Institute for the Development Studies a livelihood comprises the capabilities, assets, and activities for a means of living and it is the sustainable, when it can cope with and recover from stresses and shocks maintain or enhance its capabilities and assets, while not undermining the natural base. The livelihood perspectives have been central to rural development thinking and practice in the past decade (Ian Scoones- 2009). People rather than the resources which they use the priority concern in the livelihoods approach, since problems associated to development often root in adverse institutional structures impossible to overcome through simple asset creation. At a practical level this implies a detailed analysis of people’s livelihoods and their dynamics over time. A holistic view
is aspired in understanding the stakeholder’s livelihoods as a whole, with all its facets. This does not intend to be an exact representation of the way in the world. Just as people’s livelihoods and the institutions that shape them are highly dynamic and the approach in order to learn from changes and help mitigating negative impacts, whilst supporting positive effects. In its simplest form, the framework depicts stakeholders as operating in a context of vulnerability, within which they have access to certain Assets. These gain their meaning and value through the prevailing social, institutional and organizational environment (Transforming structures and Processes). This context decisively influences the livelihood strategies that are open to people in pursuit of their self-defined beneficial livelihood outcomes. Further there are cascading effects of poverty, unemployment, poor and inadequate infrastructure in rural areas. Hence, rural development which is concerned with economic growth and social justice, improvement in the living standard of the rural people by providing adequate and quality social services and minimum basic needs becomes essential. The present strategy for rural development mainly focuses on poverty alleviation, better livelihood, opportunities, provision of basic amenities and infrastructure facilities through innovative programmes of wage and self-employment. The above goals will be achieved by various programmes implemented
creating partnership with communities, non-governmental organizations, community based organizations, institutions, PRIs and industrial establishments, while the Department of Rural Development will provide logistic support both on technical and administrative side for programme implementation. Other aspects that will ultimately lead to transformation of rural life are also being emphasized simultaneously.

Though the percentage of persons below poverty level in Tamil Nadu has come down significantly to 21.12 percent during 1993-94 from 35.03 percent in 1999-2000, as a result of the implementation of various central and state sponsored schemes, the level of poverty both in absolute numbers (130.40 lakh persons) and percentage of population below poverty line in Tamil Nadu is highest among the four southern states. In spite of huge investments on wage and self-employment programmes, the level of unemployment as per the NSSO 55th round (1999-2000) for Tamil Nadu compared to All India is the second highest among major States in 1987-88 to 1993-94 and third highest in 1999-2000.

The government’s policy and programmes have laid emphasis on poverty alleviation, generation of employment as well as generation of income opportunities and provision of infrastructural resources and basic facilities to meet the needs of rural poor. For
realizing these objectives, self-employment and wage employment programmes continued to pervade in one form or other.

As a measure to strengthen the grass root level democracy, the government is constantly endeavoring to empower Panchayat Raj Institutions in terms of functions, powers and finance. Grama Sabha, NGOs, Self-Help Groups and PRIs have been accorded adequate role to make participatory democracy meaningful and effectiveness. In other words, the framework provides a checklist of important issues and sketches out the way these link to each other, while it draws special attention to core influences and processes and their multiple interactions in association to livelihoods. Hence, there is urgent need to plan and execute various livelihood programmes. In order to strengthen the weaker segments of rural society, the government of Tamilnadu has introducing a number of livelihood project which have been created a remarkable achievements and they have reduced the amount of people below poverty line and assured the livelihood security. Therefore the present study focuses on the analysis of livelihood projects implemented in Tamilnadu state.

2.2. Statement of the Problem

The human being is provided necessary natural environment and resources for leading a happy and healthy
livelihood for the human beings research, because of threats to the very existence and survival due to the diminishing resources and environmental disasters. Agriculture and its other related works have been the prime occupation through the ages. But in the post modern era, in spite of the technological and scientific innovations, the livelihood of rural people is in question. India being a developing country, strengthening of rural community and securing livelihood projects has been introduced since independence. Tamilnadu is one of the important states to implement the need based livelihood projects on its own apart from the adoption of central government programmes.

In the history of Tamilnadu, many governments have successively made several attempts to uplift the rural community, but the rural livelihood projects implemented by Dr. J. Jayalalitha, the Chief Mininster of Tamilnadu, India, who is a well-liked leader and well known as Puratchi Thalavi, a distinguished woman leader in the political history of India during 1991-1996, 2001-2006, and from 2011 onward has made remarkable achievements through changes in the livelihood of the rural community. Many numbers of examples could be cited: the recent livelihood projects on various heads have been established and implemented in an effective manner by the auspicious direction and able guidance of the Honorable Chief Minister Dr. J. Jayalalitha. Almost all the
livelihood projects commissioned by Dr. J. Jayalalitha have been made a total transformation of rural community in socially useful, economically viable and environment friendly. In all her period of leadership of the legislative assembly of the Tamil Nadu government, Dr. J. Jayalalitha has committed herself to the development and welfare of the poor, rural women, aged, agricultural laborers, girl children, rural students, rural youth, orphanage, physically abled and SC/STs and those who are below the poverty line, members of Self Help Groups (SHG) and all others who live in the remotest villages. They have been benefited and ensured the livelihood security, through various rural livelihood projects commissioned by Dr. J. Jayalalitha. Also the livelihood projects provide support to rural education, rural health, rural entrepreneurship development, sustainable management of natural resources that leads to total development in villages, in terms of integrated rural development. At this juncture, an attempt has been made to analyse the role of rural livelihood projects in securing the livelihood sources towards development of rural poor and rural area. Hence, the researcher has chosen the topic of research entitled *An Analysis of Rural Livelihood Projects Commissioned by Puratchi Thalaivi Dr.J.Jayalalitha, the Chief Minister of Tamilnadu: A Regional Planning Approach in Tamilnadu.*
2.3. **The Objectives**

Based on the background stated as above in the present study, an attempt has been made to study the livelihood projects.

The objectives of the present investigation are as follows:

2.3.1. To List out the various rural livelihood projects commissioned By Puratchi Thalaivi Dr. J. Jayalalitha, the Chief Minister of Tamilnadu.

2.3.2. To study the various rural livelihood projects, in terms of their nature, scope and areas of implementation.

2.3.3. To analyze the social, economic and demographic profile of the beneficiaries of the projects with a view to promote the livelihood sources to rural mass;

2.3.4. To find out the achievements of the rural livelihood projects and analyze their usefulness and utility of the livelihood sources to the rural poor.

2.3.5. To suggest suitable policy implications based on the relevance of the rural livelihood projects.

2.4. **The Hypotheses**

The present study has the following hypotheses:

2.4.1. The nature of the rural livelihood projects is not influenced by the location of the beneficiaries, like SRV and NRV
2.4.2. There exists a significant difference between the proportions of farmers of both locations in respect of the habitat facilities promoted through the rural livelihood projects.

2.4.3. Development measures for the promotion of livelihood security for rural poor women through rural livelihood projects are not influenced by the location of the beneficiaries like SRV and NRV.

2.4.4. The proportion of the beneficiaries in both locations of SRV and NRV is significantly different in respect of the development and welfare measures extended through the rural livelihood projects to ensure the livelihood security for agricultural labourers.

2.4.5. There exists a significant difference in the proportion of beneficiaries between the locations of project area in respect of the infrastructural resources.

2.4.6. There exists a positive association between the locations of the beneficiary (people’s) participation and realization of the usefulness of the rural livelihood projects.

2.4.7. There exist positive associations between the benefits, life security and natural resource management on the basis of the rural livelihood projects.

2.4.8. The benefits occurred for sustainable rural livelihoods through rural livelihood projects does not influence the location.
2.4.9. The location of the beneficiaries does not influence the rural livelihood projects and their coverage in respect of the social and economic development of rural poor, types of natural resources managed through rural livelihood projects.

2.5. Methodology

Both primary and secondary data were used for the present investigation. The data regarding the livelihood sources and their importance to rural development through various livelihood projects have been collected as follows.

2.5.1. Primary Data

The primary data were collected on the basis of the theme of the present study with the help of the pre-tested and well-structured interview schedule as well as personal visit to the field. The primary data include the social, economic, level of awareness, usefulness of rural livelihood projects and Rural Livelihood Security (RLP). The primary data and their sources are presented in the table 2.1.
### Table 2.1 Primary Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Social Demographic profile of Beneficiaries</td>
<td>Age, Sex, Marital Status, Children, Community, Religion Educational Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Economic Status of Beneficiaries</td>
<td>Household Income, Employment, land use Crop rotation, Irrigation sources, Housing condition and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Status Various Other Assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Awareness and Sources of Information about the RLP</td>
<td>Different Levels of Participation Village president, Relatives, Rural Institution (SHGs), BO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Announcements Mobile Phones / Mass Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Empowerment and Poverty Alleviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Assets created</td>
<td>Land &amp; Pump sets Owned, Purchase of Animals, carts and vehicles and Jewells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Level and Types of Employment and Usefulness of Additional Income</td>
<td>Self, Wage, and Seasonal Employment, Purchasing Power, Income and Additional Family Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Rural livelihood Security Through RLP</td>
<td>Habitation Development, Rural Health Measures, Development of Rural Women, Physically Abled,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agricultural Labourers, Pro-Poor, Development of Rural Infrastructural Resources, People’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>participation, Livestock Development, and Cultural &amp; Heritage Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Compiled from Various Sources- 2013.

### 2.5.2. Secondary Data

The secondary data have been collected through visits to various libraries and institutions as stated in the table 2.2. The data include the origin, nature, scope and extent of the rural livelihood projects implemented in the state Tamilnadu and Commissioned by
the Chief Minister Puratchi Thalaivi Dr. J. Jayalaitha. The relevant data related to the Chief Minister Dr. J. Jayalaitha have also been collected, in order to study the welfare and development measures extended towards livelihood security of rural people during the period of the government headed by Dr. J. Jayalalitha.

### Table 2.2. Secondary Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Profile of Study Villages</td>
<td>Concerned Taluk offices Taluk statistical offices, Block Development offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Profile of Dr. J. Jayalitha</td>
<td>Government of Tamilnadu Website</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Compiled.

#### 2.6. Study Area

The present investigation has been conducted in the select villages of various blocks across the state of Tamilnadu. The total villages taken for the investigation are 18, belonging to purely rural based blocks and the majority of population are engaged in the agricultural activities and few allied activities. Nine districts of
Tamilnadu have been covered for the present investigation such as Thirunelveli, Dindigul, Coimbatore, Thanjavur, Nagapattinam, Cuddalore, Dharmapuri, Chengapattu and Thiruvallur. The total population of these villages of the study is 46,800 and the total geographical area is 5384 sq.km. (The detailed profile of study area provided in the chapter 3). The main reason for the selection of these villages for the present study is on the basis of the regional planning approach. The sample villages, blocks and districts have been selected on the basis of nature and characteristics of the various agro-climatic regions as classified by the Ministry of Agriculture, government of Tamilnadu

2.6. Sampling Procedure

The present study is mainly focused on the project and the livelihood measures commissioned by the Puratchithalaivi J. Jayalalitha, the Chief Minister of Tamilnadu to provide the sustainable livelihoods for rural poor. The total sample respondents for the present investigation are 480, taken from various 32 villages in 16 blocks from 8 districts of Tamilnadu. The main reason for selection of the sample is to make the representation of entire state in order to analyze the livelihood projects. Among the total 33 districts in Tamilnadu state, 8 districts have been selected which represent 40 percent of the total districts of the state and 16 blocks of Tamilnadu have been
chosen for present study, represents 5 percent of the total of the 1 blocks in Tamilnadu. In each block, 2 villages have been selected on the basis of the location and the performance of various livelihood projects implemented by government of Tamilnadu, in order to promote the livelihood status of rural poor. 15 samples have been chosen from the each study village on the stratified random sample basis and the total sample size 480 from 32 villages in Tamilnadu. The location of villages has been allocated on the basis of the regional planning approach, which is prescribed by the Department of Agriculture, Government of Tamilnadu and they are popularly called agro-climatic zones. They are five main regions and three sub-regions on the basis of location, weather conditions, crops sown and rainfall status. In order to conduct reasonable analysis of the data and to draw accurate inferences, the study villages have been classified by southern region village which is

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Classification of Regions</th>
<th>Sample Particulars</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total villages covered</td>
<td>Total Blocks covered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>Southern Region villages (SRV)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Northern Region villages (NRV)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Compiled.
abbreviated by SRV and the villages located in northern region is called NRV. 50 percent of villages have been allotted to each category (Table 2.4) and totally, the study area covered in every region has 16 villages.

**Table 2.4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No</th>
<th>Study Region</th>
<th>Districts</th>
<th>Blocks</th>
<th>Villages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>Southern Region</td>
<td>Thirunelveli, Dindigul Thanjavur Nagapatinam</td>
<td>Sankarankoil, Cheranmahadevi Batlagundu, Natham, Papanasam, Thanjavur Mayiladuthurai Thalinayar</td>
<td>Paruvakkudi, Veerasigamani, Karisalpatti Malayankulam Viruveedu, Kannuvarayankottai Sendurai, Uralipatti, Thirumanakudi, Reginathapuram, Alakudi, Nanjilkottai Thruvalaputhur Nidur, Manakkudi Vattakudi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Northern Region</td>
<td>Thiruvallur Cuddalore Coimbatore Dharmapuri</td>
<td>Minjur, Thiruttani Nallur komaracthi Pollatchi(North) Anaimalai Pennagaram, Morappur</td>
<td>Kallur, Ponneri Kannikopuram, Mambakkam, Maduravalli, Nagar, Veeranatham Vadakkumangudi, Vadakkipalayam Chinnanegamam, Thalakarai, Pethanaikanur Paruvathanahalli, Nagamarai, Sungrahalli, Thoppampatti</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Records of Directorate of Rural Development, Chennai-2012.
The total villages are 16 with the total samples of 240 from each region. In short the total sample respondents of the present investigation are 480, which represent 16 blocks from 8 districts.

**Flow Chart 2. 1. Sampling Procedure**

![Flow Chart Image]
2.7. Data Collection

The primary data have been collected through a well structured interview schedule. At earlier a pilot study has been conducted in the two villages of Cuddalore and Thiruvallur Districts. After the pilot study, some modification has been made in the interview schedule, which has been strengthened on the basis of observations and personal enquiry with the beneficiaries of livelihood schemes commissioned by Puratchithalavi Selvi J.Jayalalitha, the Chief Minister of Tamilnadu. The present research has evidence with 480 samples and there were some difficulties to collect the data, which required sometimes. The period of the study was not specified, due to the conduct of analysis of the livelihood schemes implemented by government of Tamilnadu. The data collection is mainly focused on personal enquiry with the beneficiaries and field visit and observations about the status of beneficiaries and initiatives and their extent of benefits to promote the livelihood status of rural poor.

2.8. Data Analytical Procedure and Statistical Tools

The collected data have been analyzed after editing and coding, with the help of some suitable and simple statistical tools. They are descriptive statistics of percentage analysis and chi-square test that have been calculated, in order to understand the associations and significant relation between the variables. The
data analysis has been conducted, employing advanced techniques as per the approaches and strategies for regional planning towards sustainable livelihood security.

2.10. Scope and Limitation of the Study

The present study focuses on the schemes and projects pertaining to development in the livelihood status of rural poor which has been commissioned by Puratchi Thalavi Dr. J. Jayalalitha. The present investigation is the useful exercise to identify the efficacy of the livelihood projects commissioned across the state Tamilnadu. In order to make useful for planners, rural development professionals, social workers and training personnel, the research work guides and extends its approaches, strategies and procedures to plan and execute such livelihood projects in an effective manner.

The study has been conducted in the two select villages in different development blocks across the state Tamilnadu. On the basis of the agro-climatic regions, the study villages have been classified into two types of the Southern Region Villages (SRV) and Northern Region Villages (NRV), in order to make a useful and comparative analysis from region to region. To analyze the usefulness and role in the livelihood security of rural people in the Tamilnadu state, the small amount of the sample have been
drawn that represent the whole state, in the context of managing natural resources, for the livelihood security. This is needed to support the sustainable development for rural poor.

2.11. Background of the Study

The required literature has been collected and scrutinized on the basis of the objectives and the theme of the present investigation. The selected research studies have reviewed and considered as the background of the present study. All 103 literatures pertaining to the present research has been carefully reviewed and they have been classified into four different types as Level of Awareness on the Livelihood Projects, nature and scope of the livelihood projects, usefulness and utility of the livelihood projects and achievements of livelihood projects. They are as follows:

2.11.1. Level of Awareness on the Livelihood Projects

Batterbury (2001)\(^1\) examined the household livelihood strategies in a Sri Lankan Village and concluded that population forced heads of households to enter into increasingly complex relations with the outside world, and those with the initial advantages of larger land holdings are able to educate their children, find more secure sources of outside income and invest in

---

agricultural productivity, most common strategy for landless and the poorer tenant families.

Bryceson (2000)\textsuperscript{2} argued that the result of structural adjustment performance, diversification out of agriculture has become as the livelihood strategy to rural population and suggest that policy must promote the development of human capital equipping people with the skills to work on the new environment and enhancing agricultural productivity for better livelihood.

Sujith Kumar (2002)\textsuperscript{3} in his study on diversification in rural livelihood in three village of K.V.Kuppam block, Tamilnadu observed that the government of India and government of Tamilnadu implemented a number of programmes during five year plans and the consequence of these programmes has greatly influenced the occupational structure and livelihood sources.

Wilson (2010) explored the local context and livelihood of poor and landless farmers, to identify farm activities that might help agricultural productivity and long term sustainability, to share and explore prospective diversification activities with farms, and to consider the feasibility and sustainability of favored diversification activities. The researcher observes that there is a strong interest among local people’s income generating activity.


\textsuperscript{3}
Julie Dekens (2005) investigated livelihood system, to identify key drivers of change and evaluate the impacts of these changes on a livelihood system and to derive policy lessons for managing resource based livelihood with regard to power relations cross-scale linkages and resilience buildings.

Laurie (1996) found the observed strategies, capacities to contribute to sustainable livelihoods within the village and larger regional context, to gain preliminary understanding of polices which have affected household and community strategies in the past both positively and negatively, and to recommend the underlying principles and priorities for future policy in the order to strengthen sustainable livelihoods.

Thanh (2004) made an attempt to explore the interaction between the trade policies and rural livelihoods and disclosed that the impact of the trade affects social, economic and environmental systems in rural areas through the social change processes induced by the interaction of livelihoods.

Clark Langston (2008) conducted a study on out-migration and rural livelihoods in the southern Ecuadorian andes and emphasized that connections to agriculture, the environment the agrarian determine the livelihood sources for rural poor.

Rizvi (2011) stated through his study that the impact of livelihood strategies encourage socio economic development of
rural poor and its access be regarded as the key to extend the development avenues to rural poor.

2.11.2. Nature and Scope of the Livelihood Projects

Erniel, et al. (2011) revealed through their study that almost all beneficiaries of e-Agrikultura agreed that ICT could increase farm productivity, could increase farm income, could help expand livelihood and could contribute in starting a business. A similar proportion agreed that these purposes were feasible, actually realizable and sustainable.

Jayantha and Miranda (2001) concluded through their study on beyond projects: making sense of the evidence that the research has provided substantial evidence to say that ICTs can be effectively used to address the issue and rural livelihood development. Facilitating access to useful information by rural farmers, effective communication between the farmers, markets, service providers and policy makers, strengthening linkages between stakeholders, creating transparency among market stakeholders, early warning on weather and diseases, and developing institutional and individual capacities are some of the areas ICTs can directly impact.

IFAD (2001) found through its appraisal study on post-Tsunami sustainable livelihoods programme for the coastal communities of Tamilnadu that the Government has provided
compensation to farmers for crop loss and gypsum to treat the soil. NGOs have come in with deep tube wells to provide irrigation in many villages visited by the mission, although what medium to long-term impact this intervention will have on the sub-surface water regime should be assessed before problems arise.

Barrett, et al. (2001) discovered from their study on Nonfarm income diversification and household livelihood strategies in rural Africa: take into account that many households in the less-drought prone and actually hungry than those in the drought-struck northern Sahelian zone because the latter had much more diversified incomes-diversified precisely because of the high probability of drought.

Clifford Olay, et al. (2012) found through their study on contribution of agro forestry to biodiversity and livelihoods improvement in rural communities of Southern African regions that the natural forest resource continues to play a major role in improving the livelihood of rural communities in Southern Africa, and this it does, because of the rich biodiversity in forests. Thus, natural forests are able to provide for energy, food and nutrition and health. Improved agro forestry that improved livelihoods cannot be related to universal patterns of change in the attributes of asset portfolios (as suggested by the four hypotheses suggested earlier). Different paths out of rural poverty involve different
strategies and hence different patterns of change in asset holdings, functions and attributes.

2.11.3. Usefulness and Utility of the Rural Livelihood Projects

Tsikata (2009) advocated through his study Towards a Research Agenda that the efforts at addressing land and labour relations can be linked and engendered and how efforts at addressing gendered livelihood securities has been strengthened to ensure that they simultaneously reduce insecurity and promote gender equity and positive social transformation.

Fouracre (2002) concluded through his study that Livelihood outcomes are more income increased well-being reduced vulnerability improved food security (e.g. increase in financial capital in order to buy food) and a more sustainable use of natural resources and help the livelihood outcomes directly influence the assets and change dynamically.

Athreyia (2008) proved through his study that rural employment grew more slowly between 1993-94 and 2004-05 as compared to the rate of growth between 1983 and 1993-94. Between 1993-94 and 1999-2000, there was practically no growth in agricultural employment and little growth in rural employment as a whole.
Mathew (2012) identified through his study that next to agriculture, small enterprises, captured by the rubric, “micro, small and medium enterprises” (MSMEs), is the most significant nutrient of the Indian economy, which determines the livelihood security.

Sheheli (2012) advocated that the majority of the rural women have a low to middle level of livelihood status and five major areas are identified essential to improve existing livelihood situation, which are credit facilities, working opportunity, food availability, education and shelter.

Arpita (2010) discovered from her study on initiative to transform rural lives that the stakeholders of the Program include different State Governments, Panchayat Raj Institutions, Banks, SHGs, NGOs, volunteers, Line Departments which are implementing various development programs as well as the Training institutions, need to be mapped and their commitment needs to be obtained for facilitating awareness generation, enhancing people's participation in planning, monitoring, social audit and facilitating redressal of grieveness of the people.

Saravanan (2001) found from his study is governmental intervention with the establishment of road and transport and other infrastructural facilities aimed at agricultural development
towards sustainable rural livelihoods. They were taken up for their
development extending some developmental schemes.

Sivamurugan and Anbumani (2001) stated that for
initiatives, viz., cash benefits in terms of cash grants to NGOs,
central subsidy to self-employed entrepreneurs, capital and
interest subsidy for cogeneration plants and grants for power from
sewage, direct tax benefits in terms of 100 percent depreciation
and the biomass as an energy alternative will be determined by
economics provide that use their waste biomass for energy
simultaneously the total livelihood security for rural area.

Mishra (2012) concluded that the activities for creation of
water bodies and land development, a number of livelihood support
activities indeed were taken up as agriculture and horticulture
development Plantation Work, Nurseries Creation, Roadside
Plantation Work and Vermin compost new crops, technology and
cultural practices were developed to the villagers through
successful demonstrations are the livelihood measures.

According to Saravanan (2011) implementation of a number
of livelihoods initiatives need and water management and some
tribal households having no land and marginal land have to
depend on incomes from livestock from the income from wage lab
our.
Obua and Muhanguzi (2001) argued that the farmers are benefiting from indigenous tree cultivation in many ways and they are helping to control soil erosion and stabilize slopes where agricultural crops are the useful mode to all the stake holders.

Kumar (2009) suggested that to meet the domestic food requirements like, agricultural growth is limited; imports can help improve the livelihood security focus on productivity enhancement through public investment in irrigation, research and efficient use of water, plant nutrition and other inputs.

Gulati (2001) concluded that the livelihood project to implementation is indeed very much helpful precious time and resources. It suggests in a large part. People cannot participate in which the government as facilitator has to take people into confidence and allow them to be party to the process of developmental schemes.

Srinivasa Rao (2001) argued that public policy on rural credit in India has been focused on institutionalization as a means of providing livelihood security. Cooperatives, backtracked RRBs and commercial banks within rural credit have contributed to the livelihoods security.

Purushotham (2009) found that SHG promotes the organization of the poor into SHGs and building their capacity for saving, internal lending, book-keeping and acquiring the threshold
level financial management skills which livelihood strategies determine. They are SHGs not supported in terms of acquiring functional skills, entrepreneurial capabilities, technology, infrastructure and raw material support and market exposure.

Jabil Ali (2012) found that the approach of group based initiatives in various developmental programmes across developing countries has generated enormous enthusiasm among government and non-government organizations (NGOs) for achieving livelihood security of rural poor and they are significantly successful in creating social capital for betterment of the society at large.

Ilyas (2007) concluded that it is evident from the above discussion that Public Distribution System plays an important role in eradicating poverty which ensures the livelihood security in India. And the Central and State Governments spend crores of rupees for providing essential commodities to the needy people at a very low price.

Kanmony (2012) has brought out that MNREGS help to remove poverty from the rural areas, provide stable income to those who are ready to do manual work, grant some relief during the period of unemployment and underemployment and avoid migration of workers from rural areas to town areas.

Kerala Government (2011) reviewed Kudumbashre, a development programme and revamped its micro enterprise
strategy, attempting to find enterprise solutions that were sustainable and rewarding financially to the enterprise, and which would offset the intrinsic disadvantages that lead to livelihood promotion and the action plans captured the need for skill development.

Hasnip (2010) argued that irrigation played a central and dynamic role in the improvement of rural livelihoods, but is often subject to criticism of inefficiency in water use, high capital and recurrent costs, lack of sustainability, and association with inequity in the distribution of both land and water.

Khan and Saluja (2012) presented their recommendations that the village survey confirms most of the evidence related to the scheme and they have not heard of the programme, which made proactive role of the panchayat enhances more work from the scheme and better facilities at the work place towards sustainable rural livelihoods.

Kumar, et al. (2006)\(^4\) stated that training to farmers in organic production, post-harvest management and marketing will help in rapid improvement of the sources for livelihood security, with the spread of organic farming, that would promote, assured markets for organic products through contract farming, risk

coverage through insurance of organic farming, promotion of consumers’ awareness on organic products, identification of markets for organic products, development of infrastructure facilities for post-harvest management, financial support for organic agriculture, and strict monitoring for purposes of product certification for domestic and export market.

Scoones (1998)\(^5\) disclosed that livelihood perspectives offer an important lens for looking at complex rural development through various consequence of development efforts from a local-level perspectives, making the links from the micro level, situated particulars of poor people’s livelihoods to wider-level institutional and policy framings at district, provincial, national and even international level.

Government of Andhra Pradesh (2003) rightly explained that Environmental assessment tools were developed for over twenty common natural resource-based rural livelihood activities supporting the social and economic promotion of rural poor. The tools are used, which help to examine the prevalent practices and also suggest suitable alternative practices which beneficiary can have the support required for adoption of mitigation measures towards livelihood security through support SHGs.

---

Mani, et al. (2006) presented that rural India requires an “e-Granthalaya” on a mission mode for facilitating sustainable livelihoods which encourage the poverty alleviation that would create Livelihood opportunities and gainful employment.

Muvendhan, et al. (2001) suggested that the peace and its environment is the pre-condition for Gandhian approach to rural development which gives top priority to the actions for the improvement in rural livelihoods through Gandhiji’s constructive programmes, and plans for the all round development of the village.

Raju and Deepa (2010) stated that the capacity building of members of Women Self Help Groups (WSHGs) as para veterinary workers on the above modules is very much essential to undertake minor veterinary services at their villages in the light of shortage of staff and moderate availability of veterinary services. The rural women and their participation in dairying are well recognized. Further, there is a need to fill in the gap in order to bring improvement in the livelihoods of WSHGs.

Ubale and Borate (2002) provide their conclusion that agri tourism also showcases the diversity and uniqueness of locally grown products. Hence, the opportunities in this sector can boost the rural economy in terms of promotion of agri tourism requires conceptual convergence like other tourisms. Rural tourism, eco-
tourism and adventure tourism for better growth, are the better sources for livelihood.

2.11.4. Achievements of Livelihood Projects

Sontakki and Laxman (2011) presented their results that farmers with large farm holdings who invariably depend on farm labourers would be inversely affected by the NREGS Scheme, when the daily wages are more in NREGS. It would not be economical for the farmer to provide higher wages to the labour in order to retain the livelihood security for rural people.

Ragitha (2012) states that numerous rural governments use e-government to provide valuable information to citizens, but while information and downloadable documents are quite common, online transactions are yet to be implemented in most rural communities which promote the sources for rural livelihoods.

Sinha (2010) revealed the bamboo initiative well beyond the contours of a commercial success, actually touching and changing lives, infusing hope and more. It gives a sense of pride in one's capability, a new-found security amidst the tough options of earning a decent livelihood.

Akthat and Aziz (2012) disclosed that the MGNREG provide the welfare for the section of the population that does not even earn the minimum wage which reduces the distress migration and it is suggested that to prevent rural-urban migration, it only seeks
to highlight that it should become a priority to implement MGNREGA as efficiently as possible because there are enormous secondary benefits from the Act which could really have a positive impact on economic secondary benefits which is the set of goals for poverty alleviation and rural development in the sustainable bases.

Parvathi, et al, (2009) stated that the majority of the farm women continue to use traditional tools and techniques for many post-harvest operations for their livelihoods security.

Mukharjee (2001) stated that many things happen at the micro-level which encourage sustainable use of resources and help in reducing socio-economic tensions as well as social obligations of individuals, companies, countries and many international organizations to determine the livelihood security for rural poor.

Subbulakshmi (2003) concluded that the dairy farming activity in the study area is a profitable one, with the use of milch animals being equal to Rs.423 per month for members of the society and Rs.378 for non-members. Thus, it maybe concluded that dairy farming in the study area has been an economic activity of a fitting consideration and that it is a viable work that facilitates an honorable, independent and contenting livelihood.

Rao and Seetharaman (2001) stated that for building components based on raw materials available in the rural areas, other alternative material components could usher environment
friendly which would recycle materials and cultured timber for housing on wasteland and other land unsuitable for agriculture. This would generate substantial employment. Similarly watershed development must be accelerated to conserve water, stop soil erosion and re-generate tree cover. All this would improve the rural habitat.

Ministry of Rural Development, Government of India (2011) indicates that the poor would be facilitated to achieve increased access to their rights, entitlements and public services, diversified risk and better social indicators of empowerment. NRLM also aims at harnessing the innate capabilities of the poor and complements them with capacities (information, knowledge, skills, tools, finance and collectivization) to deal with the rapidly changing external world.

Turton (200) revealed from his study on Framework useful for integrating perspectives and understanding complex interactions. The capital assets component was useful in highlighting the importance of access and entitlements. It highlighted the importance of non-land-based activities for the poor. It highlighted inter relationships within communities/watersheds and also potential conflict between
different livelihoods strategies. It made external linkages beyond the project area, e.g: rural urban linkages

Ministry of Rural Development, Government of India (2011) advocated that SHGs are the primary building blocks of the proposed interventions in NRLM. The groups are encouraged to initiate savings first and use the same to meet the consumption credit needs of members through a system of internal loaning to build a sense of ownership and mutual support. In addition to own savings the groups are provided with revolving funds and loans from banks to augment the capital and meet the varied social and business credit needs of members to support and stabilize their livelihoods. Groups would evolve their own norms and bylaws for managing the activities. SHGs would be organized into federations at various levels to build and sustain linkages with banks and mainstream institutions and also to undertake collective action for social development.

Ashley (2000) argued that development impact of tourism as jobs and cash is an over-simplification. Local people have complex livelihood strategies, based on multiple land-uses, and diversification of risk across several activities. These are affected by tourism in many different ways, positively and negatively, directly
and indirectly. Secondly, different types of community tourism ventures have different types of livelihood impacts.

Government of Andhrapradesh (2012) suggested that A set of detailed EA tools were developed focusing on specific livelihood activities. The tools focused on identifying practices and technologies that could mitigate negative impacts and enhance positive impacts of the livelihood activities on the environment. The grass roots level functionaries of the IKP as well as external resource persons were trained in the use of these tools. These tools were to be used in the context of the proposals submitted by the SHGs for credit. Field visits were made to a sample of livelihood activities supported by the IKP and recommendations for better management were provided in the form of reports to the DRDA and SERP.

Lukas and Cahn (2008) found from their study that conversion to organic farming reduced the reliance on credits and the risk of crop failure due to pests, diseases and droughts, thereby reducing vulnerability. In addition, the farmers mentioned enhanced natural assets, reduced risk of pesticide poisonings, improved food safety, higher levels of self-sufficiency, and the access to networks supporting knowledge exchange and political participation as important benefits of the conversion. However,
almost all the case study farmers noted that the conversion period was difficult due to temporarily declining yields and a lack of information and experiences. This is likely to be a major constraint preventing asset-poor farmers from adopting organic agriculture.

Ministry of New and Renewable Energy, Government of India (2009) disclosed from the study that The many innovative interventions initiated through this project constitute meaningful efforts to improve the lives of the people in these communities through providing renewable energy for lighting, cooking and motive power and to build capacity, facilitate livelihood generation and, in many cases, enable access to education and health facilities. Night schools enable young children to study and may protect them from inheriting their parents” poverty. Most of the villages selected for implementation of this project exhibit characteristics that lead to persistence of poverty, such as remoteness, low agricultural productivity, dependence on rainfed agriculture and illiteracy. Several interventions that have been initiated in this project such as provision of livelihood generating equipment, value addition as in the case of wool carding, access to assured water such as from lift irrigation, access to assets such as
community or group owned livelihood generation equipment etc will enable people to move out of poverty.

Mummundi (2009) argued that more meaningful to look at women’s participation in IGA and explore their motivations for and against an IGA through the livelihood framework. The case studies discussed in this paper is an attempt in this line. The case studies show that women do not isolate their participation in one institution from the other. They are individuals carrying in them composite identities and responsibilities prioritizing one from another at different contexts. We need to acknowledge that livelihoods are controlled by many factors as in the five ‘capitals’ or resource base of the livelihood framework and not narrowly judge the impact of microfinance on enterprise development, all the more as women and their participation in IGA shown through the above case studies did not start with them becoming SHG members.

Sherbinin et.al, (2009) proved through the study on though the linkages are mediated by many complex and often context-specific factors, there is strong evidence that dependence on natural resources intensifies when households lose human and social capital through adult morbidity and mortality, and qualified evidence for the influence of environmental factors on household
decision-making regarding fertility and migration. Two decades of research on lifecycles and land-cover change at the farm level have yielded a number of insights about how households make use of different land-use and natural resource management strategies at different stages. A thread running throughout the review is the importance of managing risk through livelihood diversification, ensuring future income security, and culture-specific norms regarding appropriate and desirable activities and demographic responses. Recommendations for future research are provided.

Goldman et.al, (2000) concluded that an innovative and participatory methodology has been developed for doing this, which has been refined over the period of the study. Care has been taken to ensure local ownership, and this seems to be bearing fruit, since the strategies that have been proposed are being taken forward. The SL framework has proved a useful analytical device and helped to generate a wide range of recommendations to improve the lives of poor rural people. The challenge for each region is now to build these into a plan of action which effects change at the macro and micro levels.
Rajvansh (2007) disclosed that the excessive greed of profit making by becoming sustainable in our personal lives and giving something back to the society will help make India a holistic and sustainable society according to the dream of Mahatma Gandhi, through the various livelihood projects implemented in the state.

IFAD (2000) has brought out the conclusion of its study that project has sought to improve the livelihood of vulnerable groups in a sustainable manner through improved management of their natural resource base that would restore and protect the environment. To achieve this goal, various governmental organisations and community partners have created community-based organizations and engaged them in income generating activities, supported the development of transportation, market and health/sanitation infrastructure, and promoted environmental protection.

2.12. Research Gap

It is found from the review of earlier studies on the theme of the present research presented above that the policies, approaches, strategies and various initiatives as the projects and development programmes are immensely useful to promote and secure the rural livelihoods for the rural poor. The achievements of
the rural livelihoods projects are the useful mode to the sustainable livelihood of rural mass. However, the levels of awareness among the rural people about the rural livelihood projects and their various aspects as well as the achievements are the need of the hour, towards the analysis in future, in order to identify the importance and its efficacy to extent of the development of rural people.
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