

Response of the beneficiaries about the infrastructural facilities made available during the training period

Dr. Dilip Kumar Trivedi

*Lecturer, Department of Agriculture Extension Education
S.P.R.S. Govt. College, Sawaimadhopur, Rajasthan, India*

Abstract: Infrastructural facilities includes physical facilities available in the class room as well as outside the class during the training period. Boarding and lodging arrangement provided to the trainees are also considered as one of important aspects of the trainings. Without these facilities, the trainees do not feel comfortable at the institutions and this may adversely affect the learning process.

Keywords: Infrastructural facilities, TRYSEM, Training, Training Period.

Introduction

In the teaching learning process physical facility is equally important with other four elements of learning process i.e. teacher (instructor), learner (trainees), course content and teaching material used during the training. Absence or lack of physical facilities during training affects teaching-learning process and the objectives of it cannot be achieved. With a view to know whether participants were satisfied with the lodging and boarding arrangements made during training period, their opinions were recorded on a three points scale.

Opinion of trainees about lodging facility:

An attempt was made to find out the opinion of the trainees about lodging facility made available during training period and is presented in Table 1.

S. No.	Categories	Wt.	A		B		C		D		Overall A+B+C
			TRYSEM	Home Sc.	Gen. Ag.	F	%	F	%	F	
1	Most appropriate	3	7	35	12	60	4	20	23	38.33	
2	Appropriate	2	13	65	8	40	8	40	29	48.33	
3	Inappropriate	1	-	-	-	-	8	40	8	13.33	

In case of Home Science training 60 per cent farm women beneficiaries viewed that lodging facility was most appropriate and 40 per cent participants expressed their views that it was appropriate.

In General Agriculture training programme 20 per cent farmers were satisfied with lodging arrangement made during training period and expressed that it was most appropriate. 40 per cent of them expressed that it was appropriate and the same (40 per cent) were dissatisfied with lodging arrangement and viewed that it was poor without any appropriate suggestions.

In Home Science and TRYSEM programmes no respondents were dissatisfied with lodging facility made available during training period.

When we compare all the three types of training programmes on the basis of their mean score obtained (Table 2) Home Science training got the highest mean score 2.6, followed by TRYSEM mean score 2.35, and last General Agriculture with mean score 1.8. It means in case of Home Science training lodging arrangement made by institute was better than TRYSEM and General Agriculture trainings. This higher score in case of Home Science training programme might be due to better attention provided to farm women as compared to male trainees. This is also very essential as women need greater attention from the view point of the safety, better stay and food arrangement. Less attention to farm women training programme, sometimes, adversely affect their participation in institutional training camps as they rarely find time to come-out of their houses and stay for 2-3 days in any training programme. Thus, providing much better facilities will attract and motivate them to participate in the training programmes.

Further C.D. was calculated to find out significance of difference between different combinations of training programmes.

S.No.	Training programmes	M.S.	Rank
A	TRYSEM	2.35	2
B	Home Science	2.60	1
C	General Agriculture	1.80	3
D	Total M.S.	2.25	

It indicates that the calculated F value is greater than tabulated F value at 1 per cent level of significance. Hence null hypo (H₀) "There is no difference in the opinion of trainees in all the three types of trainings with respect to lodging arrangements made during training period" is rejected. It means there was a highly significant difference in different types of trainings.

When General Agriculture and TRYSEM were compared there was a significant difference. It means lodging facility was different in both type of training programmes. In General Agriculture and Home Science training difference was significant.

In Home Science training facility of transport was provided by the training organizer to carry some of the trainees from their village who were from a long distance for them it was difficult for the organizer to provide transport facility regularly during the training period. Hence, the women trainees expressed their satisfaction for boarding facility. 40 per cent farm women beneficiaries expressed that boarding facility was not available to them where as one trainee of TRYSEM and one of General Agriculture training programme were not satisfied with boarding arrangement provided during training period.

When the trainees were asked to give their suggestions for boarding and lodging arrangements very few (5 to 10 per cent) of them said that it was not proper. Therefore every possible care should be taken while making the arrangements to satisfy the trainees, because this has an adverse effect on

what is learned during training and will cause a set back to the whole programme. The participating farm women were of the opinion that lodging and boarding facilities should be made available at the centre.

It is found that most the beneficiaries MHADA were male. Most of the respondents in beneficiaries of MHADA were illiterate as well as they have up to primary and Secondary education. But they have not well educated. Because they came under BPL and they have less source to get education.

The beneficiaries of MHADA in present study, mostly belongs to Hindu religions because in study area the Hindu population was more than other religions.

1. It was found that the most of the beneficiaries of MHADA in study area were come under BPL. Because the beneficiaries were low income group peoples such as workers, or labour, similarly the scheme specially designed to the economically weaker section hence most of respondents were came under below poverty line.
2. MHADA beneficiaries in study area were working in various private small businesses as well as in MIDC as a worker. Similarly they were hawkers' or owner of pan shop. But they have rarely their own business of form because they have not sufficient money to establish a business where as they have not well educated to get good job.
3. The MHADA beneficiaries peoples socially developed peoples and they have a contribution towards the welfare of the socially.
4. 7 Most of the beneficiaries were low income group people hence they have income upto Rs. 30,000 (Per Year) because they have less resources to earn money while they have less income most of them save their money for education and other purpose in Bank insurance, Real estate, Bhishi, Gold/ silver etc. Such savings of investment was benefited them face the financial problem in future.
5. MHADA house provides social security to the peoples. MHADA house was cause to

increase the standard of living of peoples. It secured the peoples from inslum area from thief, rain etc. It provides safe environment, Social stability and basic facilities to the people.

6. It is absorbed that most of the MHADA beneficiaries lived in slum and trespass areas as well as in Kaccha houses before get MHADA house. Such area not good for the health of peoples. Hence MHADA providing Pacca houses.
7. Previously observed that MHADA beneficiaries were illiterate. Hence they unable to access the information about MHADA Scheme. It found that officers of MHADA.

Conclusion

Infrastructure plays a pivotal job in the public arena and economy by offering types of assistance to families and industry. For families, the accessibility of transport, power, safe water and sterilization, and other essential offices immensely affects working on the personal satisfaction. This is particularly the case for less fortunate families. For industry, foundation administrations work with creation, transport and exchange that all prod financial development, which thus helps in lessening neediness. Besides, foundation improvement can likewise help an economy to better location environmental change and decrease its weakness from shocks and fiascos. The foundation comprises of hard and delicate parts. The hard or noticeable part should be joined with the delicate foundation, which incorporates arrangements and guidelines. This is to permit the framework to perform and have the expected effect. The delicate framework should likewise uphold the hard foundation to guarantee that the right blend and collaboration of the two can uphold comprehensive development and destitution decrease by extending admittance to essential administrations and working on financial open doors for all.

Arranging, planning, developing and working framework frameworks are troublesome undertakings and they likewise require a ton of assets. Thusly, the public authority needs to

work with the confidential area in open confidential organization to facilitate the public area monetary and managerial weights and to use private area mastery and abilities. By and large, the public authority additionally needs to play the main job given the nature and attributes of framework item.

REFERENCES

1. F.A.O. 1975. Agricultural Extension and training report of the committee on agriculture. Third session, Rome.
2. Flippo, E.B. 1961. Principles of personnel management, TOKYO Kugakusha Co. Ltd.
3. Glasser, R. 1965. Training Research and Education. Science Edition, John Wiley and Sons. Inc., New York.
4. Hoffer, C.R. and Stangland, D. 1958. Farmers attitudes and values in relation to adoption of improved practices in corn growing. Rural Sociology, 23 p. 112-120.
5. Jayarama, C.K. and Reddy, B. 1972. Adoption of improved agricultural practices in A.P. Indian Jr. of Extn. Edu. (1 and 2) p. 14-23.
6. Jha, P.N. and Shaktawat, G.S. 1972. Adoption behaviour of farmers towards hybrid bajra cultivation. Indian Jr. of Extn. Edu., 8 (1 and 2) p. 10-18.
7. Kalla, P.N. 1988, A study on impact of Lab to land programme on behavioural changes of farmers of Rajasthan state. Ph.D. Thesis (Unpublished), Rajasthan Agril. University, Bikaner (Campus - Udaipur).
8. Knowles, M. 1959. A guide for administrators, leaders and teachers. Indian Jr. of Extn. Edu., p. 12-17.
9. Kulhari, V.S. 1980. A study of recognised agriculture extension training and visit system and its impact in Chambal Command area development project in Rajasthan. Ph.D. Thesis, Div. of Agril. Extension, I.A.R.I., New Delhi.
10. Lynton, R.P. and Pareek, U. 1967. Training for development Richard D. Irwin. Inc. and the Dorsey Press, Homewood, Illinois, U.S.A.