

## Constraints in People's Participation in Watershed Development Programme

S.S. Sisodia<sup>1</sup> and Chitranjan Sharma<sup>2</sup>

1. Asstt. Prof. (Agril. Extension) LWMRTI, 2. Asso. Prof., DEE, MPUAT, Udaipur

### ABSTRACT

*This investigation was carried out to study the constraints faced by the farmers in adoption of watershed development programmes. Molela watershed of Rajsamand district of Rajasthan was selected for this purpose. 180 watershed beneficiary farmers were personally interviewed for this purpose. The study reveals that among technical constraints, improved breed of he buffaloes and ram were not provided to the farmers. Trainings were not given under household production system to the masses of backward castes, high mortality of horticultural plants, etc. whereas, among physical constraints, field visits of well established watersheds were not conducted, audio-visual aids were not used and reference material were not provided during training period to the beneficiaries. It was also revealed that watershed beneficiaries were not taken in confidence during budget utilization. Budgetary provision, progress and future plans were not discussed among the beneficiary farmers were the major institutional constraints.*

**Key words :** Constraints; People participation; Watershed development programme

The sustainable agricultural development in this changed context can only be achieved with the conservation of soil and water (basic natural resources) coupled with human resources development to meet the new challenges of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. The Govt. of India has implemented nationwide massive and nicely designed programme for rainfed area development under National Watershed Development Project for Rainfed Areas (NWDPR). All possible factors have been considered in the programme. Soil and water conservation work along with various aspects of agricultural production have been incorporated in the project areas. Field functionaries and beneficiary farmers were trained as per the plan till than the desired participation of the rural communities could not be achieved for better implementation of programme. Therefore, efforts in this study were made to find out the reasons of poor participation of beneficiaries in the programme. Keeping this view in mind, a study was undertaken with an objective "To study the constraints in people's participation in watershed development programme".

### METHODOLOGY

The study was conducted in Molela watershed of Rajsamand district of Rajasthan. A list of villages of this watershed was obtained from the office of Deputy Director, Watershed Development & Soil Conservation, Rajsamand. All the eight villages of the watershed were included in this study. List of users committee presidents

of these villages were collected from the office of Assistant Engineer-Delwara, Rajsamand. Thereafter, a list of beneficiary farmers were collected from respective users committee presidents of respective villages. Out of this list total 180 respondents were selected for the study. The data were collected by personal interview technique.

### RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

*Technical constraints* : Review of Table 1 indicates that animal husbandry was the second major occupation of the beneficiaries and improved breed of he buffaloes and ram were urgently required for improvement of local breed. Veterinary facilities in the area was inadequate therefore, farmers were expecting this help under National Watershed Development Project. This constraint was ranked on 1<sup>st</sup> position.

No trainings were conducted under household production system and high mortality of horticultural plants was ranked by the farmers on 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> rank. Cross bred animals are highly sensitive and farmers fear the death of such costly animals due to poor veterinary facilities were the 4<sup>th</sup> major problem.

Whereas, grass varieties introduced not suitable for this area was ranked on 17.5<sup>th</sup> rank (as they were demanding *Seran* grass seed). Soil conservation structures were among the least problem (rank 19<sup>th</sup>), and too little time spent by officials to meet beneficiaries was ranked 20<sup>th</sup>.

Table 1. Technical constraints faced by the beneficiaries

S. No.	Constraints	Mean Score	Rank
1	Improved breed males were not provided	2.76	1
2	No training was given under household production system	2.67	2
3	High mortality of horticulture plants	2.24	3
4	A.I. breeds are sensitive to diseases.	2.11	4
5	Raw material is not available for HHP system	2.07	5
6	HHPS was not linked with marketing of produce	2.05	6
7	Cross breed calves could not be used for draft purpose	1.95	7
8	Not enough practical training was given	1.94	8
9	Latest technical know how of WS activities was not available	1.82	9
10	A.I. cases were not successful	1.78	10
11	Fruit plants were not of good varieties	1.68	11
12	(Watchman) chowkidar may be provided by Government for pasture development	1.57	12
13	Desired fruit plants were not given	1.52	13
14	Poor condition horticulture plants were given	1.49	14
15	Trees of desired species were not provided	1.38	15
16	Knowledge of field functionaries about subject matter was not satisfactory.	1.28	16
17	Soil and water conservation structure were not in good conditions due to poor maintenance	1.02	17.5
18	Grass varieties were unsuitable for this area	1.02	17.5
19	Soil and water conservation structure were not satisfactory	0.91	19
20	Too little time was spent by the officials to meet beneficiaries	0.79	20

*Physical facility constraints* : The farmers response related to the physical facilities created by the host institution (NWDPR) during educational activities have been recorded. As these facilities create learning environment for beneficiaries to learn and provide opportunities for the trainers to effectively disseminate his message to the learners.

Table 2. Physical facilities constraints faced by the beneficiaries

S. No.	Constraints	Mean Score	Rank
1	Field visit of good work done not organized	1.79	1
2	No projected aids were used during training	1.63	2
3	Reference material during training were not provided	1.57	3
4	Training place was not convenient	0.51	4
5	Meeting place was not convenient	0.45	5

The data of the Table 2 signaled that more number of farmers wanted to visit the other developed watersheds,

hence they ranked it on first priority. No projected aids were used during training programmes was the second major constraint. Reference material was not provided during training sessions as 3<sup>rd</sup> problem. Whereas, meeting and training place were convenient to majority of farmers so they were ranked on 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> place, respectively.

*Institutional constraints* : The farmer's responses regarding institutional constraints were recorded and the results are presented in the form of mean score and rank in Table 3.

Table 3. Institutional constraints faced by the beneficiaries

S. No.	Constraints	Mean Score	Rank
1	Farmers were not taken in confidence while utilization of funds for watershed activities	2.42	1
2	Budgetary provisions for various watershed activities were not discussed before beneficiaries.	2.27	2
3.	The progress and future plans were not discussed among beneficiaries in periodical meetings.	2.06	3
4	Mid term monitoring and evaluation of watershed activities were not done.	2.03	4
5	Beneficiary's role in watershed activities and benefits desired by them were not discussed before starting the programme.	1.62	5
6	Beneficiaries were not taken in confidence before starting the programme.	1.57	6
7	Follow up of activities were poor.	1.51	7
8	Beneficiary feels it is a target oriented work and has to be implemented by any means.	1.35	8
9	Govt. field functionaries have not established rapport with beneficiaries.	1.23	9
10	Behavior of Govt. field functionary with beneficiaries was not satisfactory.	0.95	10

The review of above table indicates that farmers were not taken in confidence in utilization of funds for watershed activities as pointed out by most of them. The budgetary provisions for various watershed activities were not discussed before beneficiaries, as expressed 2<sup>nd</sup> major constraint, progress and future plans were not discussed among beneficiaries in periodical meetings was 3<sup>rd</sup> constraint, mid term monitoring and evaluation of watershed activities were not done was the 4<sup>th</sup> major constraint.

It also concludes that the rapport and behavior of Government field functionaries with beneficiaries were among the least problem. Hence, both the constraints were ranked on 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> by the beneficiaries.

## CONCLUSION

Major technical constraints faced by the watershed beneficiaries were the improved breed of he buffaloes and ram were not provided, training were not given under household production system for masses of backward castes, high mortality of horticultural plants. Whereas, major physical constraints were field visit of well

established watershed were not conducted, audio-visual aids were not used and reference material were not provided during training period to the farmers. While watershed beneficiaries were not taken in confidence during budget utilization, progress and future plans were not discussed among the beneficiaries were the major institutional constraints faced by the watershed beneficiaries.

## REFERENCES

1. Daipuria O.P., M.S. Kakran and S.P. Sharma (2003). Constraints in adoption of Watershed Management Technologies. Paper presented in the "National Extension Education Congress", organised by Society of Extension Education, Agra held at Agra Sept. 12-14, 2003.
2. Mishra, A.A., Awasthi, P.K. and Jaiswal, D.K. (1987). Constraints in Utilization of Farm Technology in M.P. Paper presented in the seminar on "Constraints in TOT" held at KVK, Dapoli Oct. 20-2003.
3. Waman G.K. and Patil P.S. (2000). Production, Storage and Marketing of Onion Growers. Maharashtra. *J. Extn. Edu.*, **XIX**, 2000.

□ □ □ •