The Andhra Agric. J 55(3):405-407, 2008

# Extent of Participation of Farmers in Sujala Kalinganahalli Halla Watershed Project

**T V Suresh and Ch Ramesh Babu**
Department of Extension Education, Agricultural College, Bapatla 522 101, Guntur District (A.P)

**ABSTRACT**

Study was conducted during 2006-07 in Tumkur district of Karnataka. Majority of the respondents had medium extent of participation (64.77%) followed by high (28.33%) and low (7.5%) extent of participation. Majority of the respondents had medium extent of participation followed by high and low in activites like motivational meetings (62.50%, 26.67% and 10.83%), planning (68.34%, 23.33% and 8.33%), implementation (62.50%, 25% and 12.50%), Maintenance (67.50%, 28.33% and 4.17%) and evaluation (66.67$%, 29.16% and 4.17%).

**Key words :** Evaluation, Implementation, Participation, Planning, Watershed.

The National Watershed Development programme for Rainfed Areas was launched during eighth five year plan to carry out watershed activities in the country. World Bank assisted watershed project 'Sujala' was implemented in five districts of Karnataka during 2001-07. Participation of farmers is necessary for watershed project to become successful, as they are the major stakeholders in management of natural resources like soil and water. Hence, present study was taken up with the objective to assess the extent of participation of farmers in Sujala Kalinganahalli Halla watershed project.

## MATERIAL AND MATHODS

The study was conducted by ex-post facto research design, Kalinganahalli Halla sub watershed in Tumkur district of Karnataka was purposively selected and out of 10 micro watersheds, four were selected randomly. The villages Manchaladore and Nalluru; Yaraballi and Jogihalli; Kalinganahalli and Matha were selected from Manchaladore. Yaraballi, Kalinganahalli and Matha micro watersheds respectively. The proportionate random sampling procedure was followed for selection of 120 respondents. A pre-tested interview schedule was used for data collection. The Collected data was analysed by using frequency, per cent age, mean and standard deviation for meaningful interpretations.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

From the Table 1, it could be inferred that majority (64.17%) of farmers had medium extent of participation followed by high (28.33%) and low (7.5%). The similar trend was observed in profile characteristics of farmers and hence the same result reflected in their participation in watershed activities.

Table 1. Distribution of respondents according to extent of participation.

n = 120

| S.No. | Category | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Low | 9 | 7.50 |
| 2 | Medium | 77 | 64.17 |
| 3 | High | 34 | 28.33 |
| | Total | 120 | 100 |

Mean = 20.77 S.D = 8.159

The reasons for high extent of participation might be collective effort from Watershed Development Department and Non Governmental organizations which were directly related to people and convinced them to participate in watershed activities. The encouragement and proper suggestion by fellow farmers also might have contributed for farmer's participation in watershed project.The finding is in conformity with findings of Patil *et al*. 2006.

Extent of participation includes five main components namely motivational meetings, planning, implementation, maintenance and evaluation.

Table 2. Distribution of respondents according to participation in motivational meetings.

n = 120

| S.No. | Category | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Low | 13 | 10.83 |
| 2 | Medium | 75 | 62.50 |
| 3 | High | 32 | 26.67 |
| | Total | 120 | 100 |

Mean = 5.19 S.D = 2.03

It was clearly noticed from Table 2. that majority (62.50%) of respondents had medium extent of participation in motivational meetings followed by high (26.67%) and low (10.83%) . More than half of the respondents understood the concept of watershed development and were willing to discuss their problems with neighbour farmers, officials and field functionaries of project but their participation was observed at medium extent due to busy schedules of their farm works and personal problems. However, a few respondents who were enthusiastic attended motivational meetings regularly inspite of their busy schedule in farm works. The higheconomic motivation and communication behaviour might have contributed mainly for their high extent of participation. But few respondents had low extent participation due to their reserved character and trust in old traditional ways of agriculture and poor economic conditions. Progressive farmers and village leaders should encourage these farmers to participate in motivational meetings to discuss their problems and doubts regarding soil and water conservation practices.

Table 3. Distribution of respondents according to extent of participation in planning

n = 120

| S.No. | Category | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Low | 10 | 8.33 |
| 2 | Medium | 82 | 68.34 |
| 3 | High | 28 | 23.33 |
| | Total | 120 | 100 |

Mean = 4.89 S.D = 2.14

It was visible from Table 3 that majority of respondents (68.34%) had medium extent of participation followed by high (23.33%) and low (8.33%). A perusal of study gave a clear indication of the fact that planning was the function of many parameters like knowledge, confidence level, responsibilities bearing capacity.

It was observed that majority of respondents were medium in these parameters and their extent of participation was medium. However, some of the respondents had favourable condition regarding these parameters and hence their extent of participation was observed high in planning of watershed activities. Possible remedies to increase the extent of participation of few respondents who were having unfavourable conditions regarding these parameters which decide the planning could be greater exposure to mass media, encouragement from neighbours and education which might bring them at high extent of participation in planning of watershed activities.

Table 4. Distribution of respondents according to extent of participation in implementation

n = 120

| S.No. | Category | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Low | 15 | 12.50 |
| 2 | Medium | 75 | 62.50 |
| 3 | High | 30 | 25.00 |
| | Total | 120 | 100 |

Mean = 3.808 S.D = 1.48

It was evident from Table 4 that majority of respondents (62.50%) had medium extent of participation in impleamentation followed by high (25.00%) and low (12.50%). Factors like adoption of recommended watershed practices, constribution of land, labour, money and participating in group discussions were related to implementation. However, majority of farmers showed average level of interest and participation regarding these factors due to their economic situation prevented them from trying modern technologies in their fields but some of the respondents with comfortable economic situation and education participated to high extent and achieved high economic profits. The attention should be paid by governmental and non-governmental organizations by extending financial aid, conducting awareness campaigns and conducting result demonstrations to eliminate ignorance about new watershed technologies which were the main reasons for low extent of participation in implementation of watershed activities.

Table 5. Distribution of respondents according to extent of participation in maintenance

n = 120

| S.No. | Category | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Low | 5 | 4.17 |
| 2 | Medium | 81 | 67.50 |
| 3 | High | 34 | 28.33 |
| | Total | 120 | 100 |

Mean = 3.26 S.D = 1.60

Results presented in Table 5 indicates that majority (67.50) of respondents had medium Extent of Participation in maintenance followed by high

(28.33%) and low (4.17%). The study revealed that maintenace was related to many factors such as social responsibility, literacy level, friendliness and community feelings of respondents. Majority of them were at medium level in these aspects but a few friendly, educated respondents were at high level in these aspects and were interested to maintain watershed assets. The immedicate attention should be paid by Watershed Development Department and NGO'S to create awareness about watershed assets and explain importance of these assets in gaining good yields and achieving economic profits.

Table 6. Distribution of respondents according to extent of participation in evaluation

n = 120

| S.No. | Category | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Low | 5 | 4.17 |
| 2 | Medium | 80 | 66.67 |
| 3 | High | 35 | 29.16 |
| | Total | 120 | 100 |

Mean = 3.75 S.D = 1.59

It was visible from Table 6 that majority 66.67%) of the respondents had medium extent of participation in evaluation followed by high (29.16%) and low (4.17%). The reasons for medium extent of participation might be the medium communication behaviour and economic motivation of respondents were highly interested in providing feed back, sharing past experiences with present results and their participation in evaluation was found to be high. The reasons for low extent of participation might be illiteracy, poverty, less economic motivation which have to be eliminated by constant efforts of village organizations such as SHG'S and village development committee.

## LITERATURE CITED

**Patil N, Manjunath L, Hirevenkangoudar L V and Bhat A R S 2006.** Socioeconomic profile and knowledge level of participant farmers about Watershed Development Programme, Karnataka Journal of Agricultural Sciences 19 (4): 867-871.

(Received on 24.01.2008 and revised on 19.06.2008)