

Chapter-V

**REVIEW OF SMALL FARMERS
DEVELOPMENT
PROGRAMMES
AND
RURAL DEVELOPMENT
PROGRAMMES**

Review of Small Farmers Development and Rural Development Programmes

Recognising the need and urgency for improving or developing the small farmers the government has formulated various policies and implemented programmes and measures. The following are the various programmes implemented earlier, some of them are in operation today also:

1. Small Farmers Development Agency (SFDA)
2. Marginal Farmers and Agricultural Labourers Development Agency (MFALDA)
3. Integrated Rural Development Programme (IRDP)
4. Million Wells Schemes (MWS)
5. Drought Prone Area Programme (DPAP)
6. Desert Development Programme (DDP)
7. Watershed Development Programme (WDP)
8. National Agricultural Development Programme (NADP)
9. Rashtriya Krishi Vikas Yojana (RKVY)
10. National Food Security Mission (NFM)
11. Agriculture Technology Management Agency (ATMA)
12. The Macro Management of Agriculture Scheme (MMA)
13. Indira Pradhan Pathakam (IKP)
14. Minor Irrigation
15. Micro Irrigation (Drip and Sprinkler System)
16. Pasu Kranthi Patham
17. Horticulture

18. Minikits
19. Agricultural Inputs Supply
20. Rythumitra Groups (RMGs)
21. Kisan Credit Cards (KCCs)

During the Fourth Plan (1969-74) SFDA and MFALDA were implemented from 1971. The objective of this programme was to assist marginal and small farmers to raise their income level. These farmers are to be helped to adopt improved agricultural technology and acquire means of increasing agriculture production like minor irrigation sources and also to diversify their farm economy through subsidiary occupation Activities like animal husbandry, dairying, horticulture etc.

It is reported that up to 1980 March, 8 million persons were assisted under the schemes. Mostly, S.Cs and S.Ts have been helped in acquiring access to improved agricultural practices through subsidised supply of inputs including implements and field demonstration. It is however criticised that there were no dedicated field staff. Further, they had to depend on the existing block staff and other departments. Financial and other outreach was very limited. There were operation difficulties in identifying eligible households and the implementing agencies were burdened with multiplicity of task.

Million Wells Scheme (MWS)

The scheme was introduced in 1988-89. The objective was to help small farmers under the poor farmers in having open irrigation wells free of cost. This increased the irrigation potential of small farmers. However, many hurdles are to be crossed.

Drought Prone Area Programme (DPAP) and Desert Development Programme (DDP)

DPAP and DDP were started to encourage sustainable management and agricultural development in specific agro ecological settings. Watershed development programmes were also started in the Eight Plan. Various studies indicated that these programmes failed to achieve the targets.

Rashtriya Krishi Vikas Yojana (RKVY)

Under this scheme 100 per cent grant will be given to the State to prepare and implement the agricultural plans for the districts and the State. The assistance would be for specific projects and also for filling gaps. This would cover provision of HYV seeds, soil health, integrated pest management and also development of rainfed farming systems, non-farm Activities, strengthening marketing infrastructure and extension services and land reforms.

Agriculture Technology Management Agency (ATMA)

ATMA shall implement the National Food Security Mission to promote and extend improved technologies along with capacity building of farmers.

The Macro Management of Agriculture (MMA)

Twenty seven schemes which were existing earlier merged in this scheme, which is in operation since 2000-01. Necessary budgetary provision is made for the schemes. Some of the schemes mentioned above have reportedly not fulfilled the targets due to a variety of factors. Recently initiated projects or schemes are yet to make an impact on the small farmers' economy.

Indira Kranthi Pathakam (IKP)

The Government of Andhra Pradesh has started this programme to undertake land leveling of the 'D' Form Patta lands assigned to Dalits and Tribals. An amount of ₹. 500 crore is allocated for this purpose. The progress under the scheme is reported to be very low.

Minor Irrigation

Community Wells Programmes are implemented by the government for the benefit of small farmers. Incentives/subsidies are given to small farmers for the purpose of electric motors and pumpsets. Later when the government has withdrawn from the maintenance of community wells, these have become defunct.

Micro Irrigation

The system is meant for covering more area under irrigation with this system and to increase farm production. Crops such as vegetables, flowers and fruits, mulberry and other dryland crops are grown under this system. Ninety per cent of the subsidy is given to small farmers towards this system. It is, however, noted that no small farmer in the selected villages has got benefit from this system. An amount of ₹. 1,150 crore is allocated to micro irrigation project by the then Chief Minister Chandra Babu Naidu. Under the Prime Minister package an amount of ₹. 640 crore is allocated to drip and sprinkler irrigation.

Pasu Kranthi Patham

Sixteen districts in the State are identified as hot spots, in which farmers committed suicides. Prime Minister package is intended to help farmers in the purchase of milch animals. This is considered as an alternative source of income to the small farmers. It is hoped to overcome the crisis in the farm sector. Farmers are supplied with milch animals on 50 per cent subsidy. As part of Prime Minister's package, an amount of ₹. 264 crore is allotted for the purpose of milch animals. However, total amount could not be spent and the target of distributing 1.17 lakh milch animals is not fulfilled.

The milch animals purchased from Haryana, Punjab and other states are found to be not suitable to the areas in Andhra Pradesh. Several milch animals and heifers died due to adverse climatic conditions, further, the animals give milk only for two or three months and then dry up. Hence, farmers are refusing to purchase animals from other states and they prefer local breeds and improved indigenous breeds. Small farmers are facing acute shortage of fodder for the animals. It is considered as a failed programme.

Horticulture

An amount of ₹. 889 crore is allocated for the development of horticulture in the State. Both State and Central governments have allocated funds for this purpose. Subsidy is given for preparation of land and digging of pits, nursery plants, maintenance of gardens, inputs, plant protection, minor irrigation etc. These subsidies and incentives have not reached the small farmers.

Mini Kits

Newly developed seeds are distributed to the farmers in small quantities as Mini Kits. Mini Kits have also been usurped by rich farmers. As part of Prime Minister's package to prevent farmer suicides a scheme on seed replacement is launched in the State with an allocation of ₹. 470.18 crore. Fifty to ninety per cent of the price is given as subsidy towards the purchase of inputs.

Agriculture Input Supply

The policy of the government is to supply seeds, fertilisers, agricultural machinery on subsidy basis to small farmers. The universal response of small farmers is that they do not get these inputs in government stores on subsidy basis. Agitations and even police firing are becoming quite common with regard to the faulty supply of inputs.

Credit Supply by Scheduled Commercial Banks to Agriculture

Not only have the Scheduled Commercial Banks been distancing themselves from the rural areas in terms of shifting or closing their rural branches, but they have also been failing in their obligation with regard to the norm set by the Reserve Bank of India, of earmarking 18 per cent in their total credit to agriculture. Despite the Government claims of increasing institutional farm credit in its successive budgets, the bank's credit during the last three years was found to be much below the 18 per cent stipulation. It was 11.8 per cent in 2005; 12.04 in 2006 and 12.49 in 2007.

Another important thing to be noted here is that figures shown under the head agriculture are not for the entire purpose of agricultural operations. These include credit to the allied Activities like animal husbandry, fisheries, hi-tech agriculture and other Activities like storage, market yards, forestry and RIDF etc. It is observed in 2005, for instance, that the animal husbandry received ₹. 3,097 crore credit; fisheries ₹. 1,301 crore; hi-tech agriculture ₹. 6,648 crore and other items ₹. 26,900 crore. Credit to all these Activities was ₹. 37,946 crore which was clubbed under agriculture and allied Activities and constituted 30.5 per cent of the credit under the head.

Credit Supply to Small Farmers by Scheduled Commercial Banks

While itself is not getting its due share in the bank credit, the small holder farmers who constitute the predominant proportion of the farming community get still a lower chunk in agriculture credit. The marginal farmers (those with holdings below 2.5 acres accounting for 63 per cent of the operational holdings), get 26.12 per cent of agricultural credit. However, those who are technically classified to be the small farmers with holding between 2.5 to 5.0 acres, whose share in the operational holdings is 18.9 per cent get 26.42 per cent of bank credit. But those with holdings above five acres who account for 18.1 per cent of the total operational holding get 47.42 per cent of agricultural credit. (The credit disbursed is taken for the period 2004-05 from the Table below; while operational holding date pertains to 2000-01 from Table. Although these are two different years, the pattern could not be very dissimilar). This suggests the phenomenon of low credit access to the small farmers, higher the holding higher would be the credit access from formal sources.

Rythumitra groups (RMGs)

The enquiry reveals that no rythumitra groups are formed in selected villages in three mandals. Lack of knowledge or information, coordination among the farmers, lack of confidence in the groups and dominance of big farmers are cited as the reasons for non-forming of rythumitra groups in these villages.

Table – 5.1: Particulars of Rythumitra Groups (RMGs)

S. No.	Particulars	Mandals			Total
		Adoni	Peapully	B. Palli	
1	Formation of Rythumitra groups in village				
	Yes	-	-	-	-
	No	100 (100.0)	100 (100.0)	100 (100.0)	300 (100.0)
	Total	100 (100.0)	100 (100.0)	100 (100.0)	300 (100.0)
2	Reasons for non-formation of RMGs				
	Lack of knowledge	20 (20.0)	38 (38.0)	22 (22.0)	80 (26.7)
	Lack of Information	15 (15.0)	10 (10.0)	12 (12.0)	37 (12.3)
	Lack of coordination among farmers	30 (30.0)	24 (24.0)	16 (16.0)	70 (23.3)
	Lack of confidence	20 (20.0)	15 (15.0)	31 (31.0)	66 (22.0)
	Big farmers dominant	15 (15.0)	13 (13.0)	19 (19.0)	47 (15.7)
	Total :	100 (100.0)	100 (100.0)	100 (100.0)	300 (100.0)

Figures in parentheses indicate percentage to their respective totals

Kisan Credit Cards

Kisan Credit Card serves as only a passbook in the bank. It does not automatically give a right to the farmers get credit from the bank. Sixty three per cent of the farmers at the overall level do not have Kisan credit cards. Fifty eight out

of 188 small holders those who do not have Kisan credit cards have not applied for credit cards. About 40 per cent of the small farmers are not aware of this particular scheme. Thirty per cent of the farmers reported that they are not given the Kisan credit cards, though they have applied for.

Table – 5.2 : Particulars of Kisan Credit Card

S. No.	Particulars	Name of the Mandals			Total
		Adoni	Peapully	B. Palli	
1	Do you have Kisan Credit Card				
	Yes	37 (37.0)	28 (28.0)	47 (47.0)	112 (37.3)
	No	63 (63.0)	72 (72.0)	53 (53.0)	188 (62.7)
	Total	100 (100.0)	100 (100.0)	100 (100.0)	300 (100.0)
2	If no, what is the reason				
	Not applied	20 (31.7)	27 (37.5)	11 (20.8)	58 (30.8)
	Applied but not given	18 (28.6)	15 (20.8)	22 (41.5)	55 (29.3)
	Not known	25 (39.7)	30 (41.7)	20 (37.7)	75 (39.9)
	Total	63 (100.0)	72 (100.0)	53 (100.0)	188 (100.0)

Figures in parentheses indicate percentage to their respective totals

Rural Development Programmes

i). Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA)

One of the important measures of poverty reduction implemented by the Government is the Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act, (MGNREGA). The Act, passed by the Parliament in August 2005, is a path breaking legislation as it guarantees wage employment on public works to any adult who is

willing to do unskilled manual work for 100 days in a year at minimum wages Act, 1948. Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act gives a right for the people for employment. It is reported that Andhra Pradesh is most successfully implementing this Act, as it stands first in the country in its implementation. The Act has become very popular in the study area. About 97 per cent of the farmers are aware of this Act. 87 per cent of the farmers got some employment under this Act. About 92 per cent of the small farmers got employment under the Act in Adoni mandal. It is the least in Banaganapalli mandal, which may be perhaps due to better farm employment opportunities. In Adoni mandal 96 per cent of the farmers agreed that they are getting prescribed wages, whereas only above 64 per cent of the farmers reported that they are getting prescribed wages in Banaganapalli mandal. At the overall level, about 83 per cent of the farmers who got employment under MGNREGA expressed that corrupt practices are ruling the roost in MGNREGA. In the implementation of MGNREGA in Adoni mandal where almost all the farmers who are reportedly getting employment under MGNREGA, about 96 per cent of the respondents emphatically expressed that corruption has been rampant in this programme.

Table – 5.3: Particulars of MGNREGA

S. No.	Particulars	Mandals			Total
		Adoni	Peapully	B. Palli	
1	Awareness about MGNREGA				
	Yes	93 (98.0)	95 (95.0)	97 (97.0)	290 (96.7)
	No	02 (2.0)	05 (5.0)	03 (3.0)	10 (3.3)
	Total	100 (100.0)	100 (100.0)	100 (100.0)	300 (100.0)
2	Getting employment under the scheme				
	Yes	90 (91.8)	82 (86.3)	79 (81.4)	251 (86.6)
	No	08 (8.2)	13 (13.7)	18 (18.6)	39 (13.4)
	Total	98 (100.0)	95 (100.0)	97 (100.0)	290 (100.0)
3	Getting prescribed wages				
	Yes	94 (95.9)	60 (63.2)	62 (63.9)	216 (74.5)
	No	04 (4.1)	35 (36.8)	35 (36.1)	74 (25.5)
	Total	98 (100.0)	95 (100.0)	97 (100.0)	290 (100.0)
4	Corrupt practices in this programme				
	Yes	94 (95.9)	75 (78.9)	71 (73.2)	240 (82.8)
	No	04 (4.1)	20 (21.1)	26 (26.8)	50 (17.2)
	Total	98 (100.0)	95 (100.0)	97 (100.0)	290 (100.0)

Figures in parentheses indicate percentage to their respective totals

On an average, two members of the family are issued employment cards for each family. On an average a person is employed 18 – 24 days in a year. The family consisting of two wage workers got employment ranging from 36 – 48 days in a

year. The total income of the family from MGNREGA works out to ₹. 3612 at the overall level. The income per family from MGNREGA is maximum with ₹. 4128 in Peapully mandal, whereas it is minimum in Banaganapalli mandal with ₹. 3096 per family in a year. The per capita income from MGNREGA works out to ₹. 1806 in a year.

The foregone discussion brings out that there is definite addition to income of the family through MGNREGA. However, this amount appears to be very small. It underlines the need for providing more number of days of employment as guaranteed in the Act. Further, the wages are also needed to be enhanced. In other words, the minimum wages Act needs to be revised. The discussion clearly establishes that the MGNREGA is not implemented in letter and spirit. A minimum of 100 days employment is not provided to the beneficiaries as per the Act, nor the allowance / half of the wages are not paid to the people for not showing the work. The respondents, although small holders, demand that the Act should be implemented in true spirit, as this would help their small farm economy through non-farm employment. The farmers also demand that the MGNREGA should be critically reviewed and suitable modifications may be made. In the implementation of the programme, it is necessary to root-out corruption. The implementing officials should be made more efficient through motivation and training. The skills of the wage earners may also be upgraded. Social auditing should be strictly conducted. Monitoring and supervision are essential parts of implementation of the programme. Evaluation of the progress in the implementation of the programme helps in getting rid of defects, deficiencies and bottlenecks in the implementation of the programme.

The wage employment helps in bettering the lot of the poor peasants. However, there is a complaint from a section of the farmers that the MGNREGA creates a scarcity of the labour especially in the peak agricultural season. There is a growing demand that MGNREGA should be linked to agriculture. Ways and means are to be worked-out in this regard by the concerned people and agencies.

Table – 5.4: Particulars of MGNREGA Employment Cards and Employment

S. No.	Particulars	Mandals			Total
		Adoni	Peapully	B. Palli	
1	Employment cards	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
2	No. of days of employment in a year	22	24	18	21
3	Total amount of family members under MGNREGA	42	48	36	42
4	Total income of the family members under MGNREGA in a year (₹.)	3,612	4,128	3,096	3,612
5	Total income under MGNREGA per person (₹.)	1,086	2,064	1,548	1,806

ii). Other Rural Development Programmes.

a. Awareness about the programmes

People in the rural areas have been facing innumerable problems and are leading a miserable life. Unemployment and low level of incomes are the twin problems faced by the farmers in the first instance. It is reported that the rural unemployment has increased from 5.6 per cent to about 10 per cent in recent years. It is seen that agricultural labour and small holders form the unorganised sector. Arjun Sen Gupta, Chairman of the unorganised sector commission revealed that 70 per cent of the workers in the unorganised sector are living just with ₹. 20 a day per worker.

In addition to unemployment and low incomes of the rural people, illiteracy, ignorance and ill-health are plaguing them. They are denied the basic necessities and amenities of life. In addition to *roti, kapda, aur makhana* (food, clothing and housing), rural people face the problems of lack of sanitation, health services, transport and communications etc.

The government both at the Central and State, have been making efforts in improving the life and living conditions of the poor people in rural areas. With this objective in view, a number of rural development schemes are conceived, formulated and implemented since the inception of Independence. In recent years the following rural development schemes aiming at improving the lot of the rural people are being implemented. MGNREGA, Indira Housing Programme, PMRY, Pension schemes, Rajiv Arogyasree, SGSY, Rajiv Yuvashakti and *Pavala vaddi* and mid-day meals schemes etc.

It is obvious from Table 5.5 that the rural people including small holders, revealed that they are aware of the government programmes. A very small number of families have reportedly benefited from schemes such as pension, Rajiv Arogyasree, Rajiv Yuvashakti and SGSY etc.

Table – 5.5: Awareness of Rural Development Programmes

S. No.	Particulars	Mandals			Total
		Adoni	Peapully	B. Palli	
1	MGNREGA	95 (95.0)	92 (92.0)	95 (95.0)	282 (94.0)
2	Indiramma Housing Programme	72 (72.0)	69 (69.0)	85 (85.0)	226 (75.3)
3	PMRY	40 (40.0)	35 (35.0)	62 (62.0)	137 (45.7)
4	Pension Schemes	76 (76.0)	68 (68.0)	80 (80.0)	224 (74.7)
5	Rajiv Arogyasree	90 (90.0)	90 (90.0)	95 (95.0)	275 (91.7)
6	SGSY	35 (35.0)	26 (26.0)	48 (48.0)	109 (36.3)
7	Rajiv YuvasShakti	42 (42.0)	48 (48.0)	56 (56.0)	146 (48.7)
8	Pavalavaddi	38 (38.0)	34 (34.0)	46 (46.0)	118 (39.3)
9	Mid-day Meals Scheme	45 (45.0)	52 (52.0)	58 (58.0)	155 (51.7)

Figures in parentheses indicate percentage to their respective totals

b. Beneficiaries of Rural Development Programmes

As elsewhere in the country, the coverage of rural development programmes is not total in terms of area and people. Many families are left out from these programmes. It is seen from Table 5.6 that only 176 out of 300 (58.7 per cent) of the selected household are covered under various rural development programmes. In other words, about 41 per cent of the selected small farm families are not covered under any development programme. The so called development programmes are not comprehensive, which means that social justice is not reaching all the needy and poor families. Identification of beneficiaries itself is defective and is also associated with corrupt practices. Influence of the politicians also plays an important role either in selecting or rejecting the small farm families for development. Amongst all the

development and welfare programmes, Indiramma housing programme appears to be somewhat popular. About 34 per cent of the total beneficiaries are covered under this programme. About 28 per cent of the beneficiaries are covered under SGSY programme. Seventeen per cent of the respondent beneficiaries got the benefit of pension. It is noted that only 10 per cent of the farmers received the medical health under Rajiv Arogyasree. It may be concluded that the development programmes have not covered the targeted people in full. Only one or two schemes have benefited the beneficiaries. The implementation of the programmes is also defective and as such full benefit is not reaching the people.

Table – 5.6: Beneficiaries under Different Rural Development Schemes

S. No	Particulars	Mandals			Total
		Adoni	Peapully	B. Palli	
1	Indiramma Housing Programme	20 (37.04)	16 (34.78)	23 (30.26)	59 (33.52)
2	Pension Schemes	05 (9.26)	10 (21.74)	15 (19.74)	30 (17.05)
3	Rajiv Arogyasree	06 (11.11)	04 (8.69)	08 (10.53)	18 (10.23)
4	Rajiv Yuvashakti	05 (9.26)	02 (4.35)	03 (3.95)	10 (5.68)
5	PMRY	04 (7.41)	02 (4.36)	04 (5.26)	10 (5.68)
6	SGSY	14 (25.92)	12 (26.08)	23 (30.26)	49 (27.84)
Total		54 (100.00)	46 (100.00)	76 (100.00)	176 (100.00)

Figures in parentheses indicate percentage to their respective totals

iii). Health programmes

The respondents reported the prevalence of the following diseases in the area. It is seen from Table-5.7 that chikengunia has attacked more number of respondents. About 85 per cent of the respondents have undergone treatment. Seventy per cent of

them have undergone treatment in government hospitals. In Peapully mandal about 79 per cent of the respondents received treatment in government hospitals. Although the government hospital is ill-equipped, people are forced to go to government hospital only because of poverty. People in Adoni have better access to private hospitals. The expenditure on health treatment has been mounting up in recent years. Only 29 out of 300 respondents have taken treatment for these ailments, 12 persons incurred an expenditure on health treatment amounting to ₹. < 20,000. Three persons had to spend more than ₹. 60,000 on an average per head on health. Even though some people are suffering from ill- health, they could not go for any treatment due to lack of money, negligence and superstitions.

Table – 5.7: Particulars of Important Diseases Faced by the Family Members

S. No.	Particulars	Mandals			Total
		Adoni	Peapully	B. Palli	
1	Heart attack	02 (5.6)	01 (3.1)	02 (4.2)	05 (4.3)
2	Cancer	01 (2.8)	02 (6.3)	02 (4.2)	05 (4.3)
3	Appendix	03 (8.3)	02 (6.3)	06 (12.5)	11 (9.5)
4	Pneumonia	04 (11.1)	03 (9.3)	02 (4.2)	09 (7.8)
5	Chikengunya	08 (22.2)	10 (31.3)	15 (31.2)	33 (28.4)
6	Typhoid	06 (16.7)	04 (12.5)	07 (14.5)	17 (14.6)
7	Kidney	01 (2.8)	03 (9.3)	02 (4.2)	06 (5.2)
8	Dengue	04 (11.1)	03 (9.3)	05 (10.4)	12 (10.3)
9	ENT	03 (8.3)	02 (6.3)	04 (8.3)	09 (7.8)
10	Malaria	04 (11.1)	02 (6.3)	03 (6.3)	09 (7.8)
Total		36 (100.0)	32 (100.0)	48 (100.0)	116 (100.0)

Figures in parentheses indicate percentage to their respective totals

Table – 5.8: Particulars of treatment

S. No.	Particulars	Mandals			Total
		Adoni	Peapully	B. Palli	
1	Do you take treatment				
	Yes	30 (83.3)	28 (87.5)	40 (83.3)	98 (84.5)
	No	6 (16.7)	4 (12.5)	8 (16.7)	18 (15.5)
	Total	36 (100.0)	32 (100.0)	48 (100.0)	116 (100.0)
2	Where do you take treatment				
	Govt. Hospital	17 (56.7)	22 (78.6)	30 (75.0)	69 (70.4)
	Private Hospital	13 (43.3)	6 (21.4)	10 (25.0)	29 (29.6)
	Total	30 (100.0)	28 (100.0)	40 (100.0)	98 (100.0)
3	If private hospital what is the cost incurred during the last one year				
	Below 20,000	06 (46.2)	02 (33.3)	04 (40.0)	12 (41.4)
	20,000 – 40,000	04 (30.7)	03 (50.0)	03 (30.0)	10 (34.5)
	40,000 – 60,000	02 (15.3)	01 (16.7)	01 (10.0)	04 (13.8)
	60,000 and above	01 (7.8)	-	02 (20.0)	03 (10.3)
	Total	13 (100.0)	06 (100.0)	10 (100.0)	29 (100.0)
4	If no, why did you not get the treatment				
	Lack of Money	03 (50.0)	02 (50.0)	05 (62.5)	10 (55.6)
	Negligence	01 (16.7)	01 (25.0)	02 (25.0)	04 (22.2)
	Superstitions	02 (33.3)	01 (25.0)	01 (12.5)	04 (22.2)
	Total	06 (100.0)	04 (100.0)	08 (100.0)	18 (100.0)

Maternity facilities

It is surprising that about 46 per cent of the females have not availed of the maternity hospital facilities. This may be the main reason for the mortality of children and mothers in the villages. Forty eight per cent of the respondents reported

that they did not practice family planning. Ninety three per cent of the respondents revealed that they are aware of Arogyasree programme and a large number of them have Arogyasree cards.

Table – 5.9: Particulars of Maternity Facilities

S. No.	Particulars	Mandals			Total
		Adoni	Peapully	B. Palli	
1	Awareness of maternity hospital facilities availed				
	Yes	66 (66.0)	54 (54.0)	43 (43.0)	163 (54.3)
	No	34 (34.0)	46 (46.0)	57 (57.0)	137 (45.7)
	Total	100 (100.0)	100 (100.0)	100 (100.0)	300 (100.0)
2	Family planning practices (No. of respondents)				
	Yes	63 (63.0)	44 (44.0)	49 (49.0)	156 (52.0)
	No	37 (8.0)	56 (22.0)	51 (22.0)	144 (48.0)
	Total	100 (100.0)	100 (100.0)	100 (100.0)	300 (100.0)
3	Awareness of Arogyasree				
	Yes	97 (97.0)	90 (90.0)	91 (91.0)	278 (92.7)
	No	3 (3.0)	10 (10.0)	9 (9.0)	22 (7.3)
	Total	100 (100.0)	100 (100.0)	100 (100.0)	300 (100.0)
4	Possession of Arogyasree health card				
	Yes	95 (95.0)	74 (74.0)	88 (88.0)	257 (85.7)
	No	5 (5.0)	26 (26.0)	12 (12.0)	43 (14.3)
	Total	100 (100.0)	100 (100.0)	100 (100.0)	300 (100.0)

IV. Pensions Schemes

The disadvantageously placed persons including old aged and widows have been receiving pension to the extent of ₹. 500 per person in the rural areas. This appears to be good relief to the beneficiaries. It is however noted that the really eligible persons are not given pension, while some of the non-eligible persons got pensions due to political pressures.

Table – 5.10: Particulars of Pensions Schemes

S. No.	Particulars	Mandals			Total
		Adoni	Peapully	B. Palli	
1	Anyone from your family getting old age pension				
	Yes	14 (14.0)	20 (20.0)	17 (17.0)	51 (17.0)
	No	85 (86.0)	80 (80.0)	83 (83.0)	249 (83.0)
	Total	100 (100.0)	100 (100.0)	100 (100.0)	300 (100.0)
2	Anyone from your family getting widow pension				
	Yes	08 (8.0)	14 (14.0)	05 (5.0)	27 (9.0)
	No	92 (92.0)	86 (86.0)	95 (95.0)	273 (91.0)
	Total	100 (100.0)	100 (100.0)	100 (100.0)	300 (100.0)

V. Public Distribution System (PDS)

Poor people are getting the food, particularly, rice at ₹. 2 kg. Fair price shops are not functioning properly in the villages and hence poor are not getting full benefit from the public distribution systems.

In conclusion, it may be stated that some of the rural development programmes have proved to be beneficial to the farm families, especially small farmers in the study area. This suggests that the safety net or social security measures are absolutely needed for improving the living conditions of the poor including small farmers. The coverage of social security should be expanded. The analysis discussed above underlines the need for proper implementation of the programme by removing the deficiencies at different levels. The delivery mechanism should be strengthened to outreach the small farm holders and other poor people in the rural areas.

* * * * *