



Profile Characteristics of Farmers Participated in Watershed Project

T V Suresh and Ch Ramesh Babu

Department of Extension Education, Agricultural College, Bapatla - 522 101, A.P

ABSTRACT

The study was conducted in Tumkur district of Karnataka at watershed project. Majority of participated farmers were studied up to primary school (49.17%) and found medium in all independent variables like decision making (59.17%), empowerment (67.50%), change proneness (65%), communication behaviour (62.05%), value orientation (57.50%) and self reliance (70.83%).

Key words : Change proneness, Education, Profile Characteristics..

Sujala watershed project was implemented in five districts of Karnataka and ensured active participation of farmers and created a sense of responsibility about their ecology and motivated them to adopt improved soil and water conservation practices. To assess the participation of farmers in watershed project it was necessary to study the profile characteristics of farmers participated in watershed project.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

The study was conducted in Tumkur district of Karnataka through ex-post facto research design. Manchaladore, Kalinganahalli, Yaraballi and Matha micro watersheds were selected randomly from Kalinganahalli Halla sub watershed. A total of 120 participated farmers were selected through proportionate random sampling procedure. The information was elicited by personal interview through structured schedule. Collected data was analysed by using suitable statistical tools and necessary inferences were drawn.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

From the Table 1, it was evident that majority of the participated farmers (49.17%) studied up to primary school followed by college (16.66%), high school (14.16%), functionally literates (9.17%), illiterates (7.50%) and middle school (3.34%). The reasons for this trend could be non availability of higher educational facilities in villages under study and poor economic situation of farmers prevented them from going to college in nearby town. Therefore efforts should be made for creating awareness about functional literacy and adult education. The finding is in concurrence with finding of Sumana (1996) and Chaitanya Kumari *et. al.* (2003).

It could be inferred that majority of (59.17%) participated farmers had medium decision making followed by low (21.67%) and high (19.16%). The plausible reasons for this trend might be majority of farmers had lower education level, less aware about choosing suitable kind of watershed activities in their won field and were average at self reliance. The finding was in concurrence with the finding of Chaitanya Kumari *et al.* (2003).

Results presented in Table 1 revealed that majority of participated farmers had (67.50%) medium empowerment followed by low (16.67%) and high (15.83%). The plausible reasons for this trend might be the majority of farmers were having average level of education, awareness about health and nutrition and Co-operation with each other. They were having medium awareness about new watershed technologies. The empowerment of farmers could be done by giving quality education formally or informally. This finding is related with earlier findings of Singh and Ushakumari (2007) and Suneetha (2007).

The result furnished in the Table 1 indicated that majority (65%) of the participated farmers had medium change proneness followed by low (16.67%) and high (18.33%). Sticking to old traditional practices and medium level acceptance of modern watershed technologies by farmers were appeared to be the possible reasons for large percentage of medium change proneness. However, few farmers who were having innovative nature had high change proneness but a few farmers having reserved nature towards old traditional practices had low change proneness. Similar trend was observed by Sridevi (2003).

The Table 1 revealed that majority (62.50%) of participated farmers had medium communication

Table 1. Profile characteristics at a glance.

Sl.No.Independent variables	Category	n = 120	
		F	P
1 Education	Illiterate	9	7.50
	Functionally literate	11	9.17
	Primary school	59	49.17
	Middle school	4	3.34
	High school	17	14.36
	College	20	16.66
2 Decision making X = 7.09 σ = 2.96	Low	26	21.67
	Medium	71	59.17
	High	23	19.16
3 Empowerment X = 18.19 σ = 2.82	Low	20	16.67
	Medium	81	67.50
	High	19	15.83
4 Change proneness X = 12.35 σ = 3.26	Low	20	16.67
	Medium	78	65.00
	High	22	18.33
5 Communication behaviour X = 10.34 σ = 2.44	Low	15	12.50
	Medium	75	62.50
	High	30	25.00
6 Value orientation X = 6.03 σ = 1.75	Low	23	19.17
	Medium	69	57.50
	High	28	23.33
7 Self reliance X = 3.21 σ = 2.44	Low	15	12.50
	Medium	65	54.17
	High	40	33.33
8 Economic motivation X = 11.98 σ = 2.006	Very low	3	2.50
	Low	1	0.84
	Medium	85	70.83
	High	24	20.00
	Very high	7	5.83

F = Freevency

P = Per centage

behaviour followed by high (25.00%) and low (12.50%). Majority of farmers were medium at friendliness, solving problems by discussing with neighbors and giving solutions to neighbours problems. This might be the reason for medium communication behaviour. However, a few farmers were having high communication behaviour had friendliness and were willing to give and take help from neighbour farmers about watershed activities. It might be the possible reason for this trend. A few farmers had low communication behaviour which could be removed by increasing their self confidence, removing mutual hatredness by involving them in group activites like selection of members for village development community, selection of crop loan beneficiaries and collectivization for community work.

Similar trend was observed by Deshmukh and Chole (2003).

It is evident from Table1 that majority (57.50%) of the participated farmers had medium value orientation followed by high (23.33%) and low (19.17%). Frequent contact with information sources and positive mental attitude towards improved watershed technologies and knowledge of few farmers about them were the elicited reasons for high value orientation. The possible solution to improve farmers having low value orientation could be conducting need based and value oriented training programmes and informal education through extension workers of Governmental and Non-Governmental organizations. Similar trend was observed by Adam (1994).

It is clear from Table 1 that majority (54.17%) of participated farmers had medium self reliance followed by high (33.33%) and low (12.50%). The perusal of the study is an indicative of the fact that majority of respondents were found to be at medium self reliance because of low education were not aware of getting bank loans for agricultural purpose. The remedies could be educating them through adult education programmes and conducting awareness generating programmes by Non-Governmental organizations. The findings were in relation with Singh and Ushakumari (2007).

The Table 1 depicts that majority (70.83%) of farmers had medium economic motivation followed by high (20.00%) very high (5.83%), very low (2.5%) and low 0.84%). The majority of farmers had medium economic motivation. The reasons for this trend might be less education, no proper awareness about micro credit programmes. Farmers having high economic motivation were willing to take calculated risks like hiring improved mechanical devices like clod breaker, slit type blade harrow, multi furrow opener and tractor for their field operations. The farmers having very high economic motivation were big farmers and dare enough to invest huge capital on construction of permanent watershed practice like farm pond in their fields and were interested in purchase of mechanical devices and tractor for field operations. The reasons for farmers with low and very low economic motivation might be less education, less exposure to modern agricultural technologies and the remedies for this could be improvement in their education level, financial aid from banks, co-operation and guidance by improved farmer neighbors. Similar findings were also observed by Chaitanya kumari et.al. (2003) and Bhagyalakshmi et.al. (2003).

LITERATURE CITED

- Adam putla 1994.** Symbiotic adoption behaviour of Palnadu Cotton. Lambadi Tribal Farmers of Guntur district M.Sc. (Ag) Thesis, Andhra Pradesh Agricultural University, Hyderabad.
- Bhagyalakshmi K, Gopalakrishna Rao V and Sudarshan Reddy M 2003.** Profile of the rural women micro entrepreneurs. Journal of Research ANGRAU, 31 (4): 51-54.
- Chaitanya Kumari M S, Prabhakar K and Shashidhar P V K 2003.** Impact of self employment programmes on income generation among tribal women', A Case study of Andhra Pradesh, Journal of Research ANGRAU, 30(1): 68-73.
- Deshmukh K A and Chole R 2003.** Social Stratification and communication behaviour of farmers in progressive and non-progressive villages. Journal of Research ANGRAU, 31(2): 75-79.
- Singh I and Ushakumari 2007.** Rural development and women empowerment. Kurukshetra 55(5): 3-8.
- Sridevi K 2003.** Study on the media exposure and consumption by farmers of adopted village Machavaram in Guntur district of Adnhra Pradesh, M.Sc(Ag) Thesis, Acharya N.G.Ranga Agricultural University, Hyderabad, A.P.
- Sumana A 1996.** Participation of farm women in watershed development project in Prakasam district of Andhra Pradesh M.Sc (Ag) Thesis, Acharya N G Ranga Agricultural University, Hyderabad.
- Suneetha R 2007.** Is DWCRA programme empowering the rural women. Kurukshetra, 55(5): 17-20.

(Received on 24.01.2008 and revised on 16.06.2008)