

**RESEARCH ARTICLE :**

Constraints faced by the beneficiaries in the use of farm pond in Marathwada region

■ D.V. SUPE, R.P. KADAM AND G.S. PAWAR**ARTICLE CHRONICLE :****Received :**
09.08.2017;**Revised :**
03.09.2017;**Accepted :**
20.09.2017

SUMMARY : The present investigation was conducted in Parbhani district of Marathwada region in Maharashtra state. The main objective of the study was to study the constraints faced by the beneficiaries in use of farm pond. The data were collected through personal interview with the help of interview schedule by contacting 80 beneficiaries. The result revealed that majority (75.00%) of the beneficiaries were having medium farming experience, followed by 26.25 per cent of the beneficiaries were educated upto secondary school level, while 50.00 per cent of the beneficiaries were having semi-medium land holding. Whereas 75.00 per cent of the beneficiaries were having medium area under irrigation, while 80.00 per cent of the beneficiaries were having medium family size. It was also found that 87.50 per cent of the beneficiaries were having low social participation, whereas 52.50 per cent of the beneficiaries were having medium level of extension contact, and 52.50 per cent of the beneficiaries were having medium level of economic motivation, followed by 63.75 per cent of the beneficiaries were having medium risk preferences. Major constraints faced by beneficiaries were higher labour wages, non - availability of credit in time, inadequacy of capital and lack of field demonstration. Beneficiaries faced problem of unavailability of labour or J.C.B., faced problem of more cost for J.C.B. than labour, faced problem of presence of agriculture assistant for taking photo, faced problem of lack of proper leadership, faced problem of lengthy time required for completing procedure, problem of unavailability of loan.

KEY WORDS :Constraints of
beneficiaries

How to cite this article : Supe, D.V., Kadam, R.P. and Pawar, G.S. (2017). Constraints faced by the beneficiaries in the use of farm pond in Marathwada region. *Agric. Update*, 12(4): 593-596; DOI : 10.15740/HAS/AU/12.4/593-596.

Author for correspondence :

R.P. KADAM
Department of
Extension Education,
College of Agriculture,
Vasantrao Marathwada
Krishi Vidyapeeth,
PARBHANI (M.S.) INDIA
Email: rpk.mkv@
gmail.com

See end of the article for
authors' affiliations

BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES

The challenges before Indian agriculture is to transform rainfed farming into more sustainable and productive system by giving social, economical and technological backup to the people who depend upon it. Moreover, the economy is mainly dependent on stability of crop production in rainfed areas. Construction of farm ponds is one of the such beneficial programme for harvesting excess

rain water during rainy season; which is implemented by the State Agricultural Development under National Agricultural Development Programme, Rashtriya Krishi Vikas Yojana (Aug 2007 In 11th five year plan) etc. The excess rain water harvested in farm ponds play a vital role in stabilizing crop production through recycling during dry spell in *Kharif* season and for protective irrigation in *Rabi* season. The major works of rain water

harvesting structure adopted in the watershed are check dams, farm ponds, nala bunds, contour bunds, vegetative covers etc. which play major role in managing and conserving the soil and water resources. However, farm pond is perceived as best rain water harvesting structure by large majority of farmers. The present study was undertaken with the following specific objective,

- To study the profile of farm pond beneficiaries
- To study the constraints faced by the beneficiaries in use of farm ponds

RESOURCES AND METHODS

The research study was selected by lottery method in Parbhani district of Marathwada region in Maharashtra State. The study was conducted in Parbhani district, from selected district four talukas were selected and from selected 4 talukas, 5 villages from each taluka were selected on the basis of maximum number of farm ponds. From each selected village 4 beneficiary farmers were selected randomly those having 3 year before farm pond after receiving its beneficiaries list from the authority to make 80 samples of beneficiaries in total. All the respondents were personally interviewed at their home and farms and data were collected. The collected data were analyzed with the help of suitable statistical methods *i.e.* frequency, percentage, mean, standard deviation, co-efficient of correlation and Z-test.

OBSERVATIONS AND ANALYSIS

The results obtained from the present study as well as discussions have been summarized under following heads:

Profile of farm pond beneficiaries:

It was found from Table 1 that majority (74.00 %) of the beneficiaries had medium farming experience and 12.50 per cent of the respondents had low and high farming experience each, followed by 26.25% beneficiaries were educated upto secondary school level and 23.75 per cent of the respondents were educated upto primary school level and higher school level both, followed by 50.00% of the beneficiaries were having semi medium land holding and 28.75 per cent of the respondents were small farmers, followed by majority of the beneficiaries (75.00%) had medium area under irrigation and 12.50 per cent having low area under

irrigation, followed by (80.00%) of the beneficiaries had medium family size, and 15.00 per cent of the respondents had high family size, followed by 87.50% of the beneficiaries had low social participation and 11.25 per cent of respondents had medium social participation, followed by 52.50% of the farmers had medium extension contact and 27.50 per cent farmers had low extension contact, followed by 52.50% had medium economic motivation and 26.25 per cent had low, followed by (63.75 %) were having medium risk preferences and 25.00 per cent having high risk preferences.

Constraints faced by the beneficiaries in use of farm ponds:

It is observed from Table 2 that (70.00%) of the beneficiaries faced problem of unavailability of labour or J.C.B. 66.25% of the beneficiaries faced problem of increased labour wages, (63.75%) of the beneficiaries faced problem of more cost for J.C.B. than labour, 55.00% of the beneficiaries faced problem of presence of agriculture assistant for taking photo, 52.50% of the beneficiaries faced problem of lack of proper leadership, 46.25% of the beneficiaries faced problem of lengthy time required for completing procedure, 40.00% of the beneficiaries faced problem of unavailability of loan, 37.50% of the beneficiaries faced problem of lack of co-operation, 25.00% of the beneficiaries faced problem of lack of fund on cash or in bank account, 17.50% of the beneficiaries faced problem of untimely availability of fund after providing documents, 16.25% of the beneficiaries faced problem of application of polythene paper in farm pond, 25.00% of the beneficiaries faced problem of Fund on cash or in bank account, 15.00% of the beneficiaries faced problem of problem in collecting documents, 12.50% of the beneficiaries faced problem of lack of contact with extension personnel, (5.00%) of the beneficiaries faced problem of subsidy only after registration of orchard and (2.50%) of the beneficiaries faced problem of yearly working of scheme. These problems occurred because of unawareness. Similar findings were reported by Ahire (2000); Shivanappan (2005); Nipanikar (2006); Kulkarni (2009); Thakur *et al.* (2014) and Deshmukh (2016).

Conclusion :

It is concluded that majority (75.00%) of the beneficiaries having medium farming experience,

Table 1 : Profile of farm pond beneficiaries			(n=80)
Sr. No.	Category	No.	%
1.	Farming experience		
	Low	10	12.50
	Medium	60	75.00
	High	10	12.50
2.	Education		
	Illiterate	14	17.50
	Primary school level	19	23.75
	Secondary school level	21	26.25
	Higher school level	19	23.75
	College level	07	08.75
3.	Land holding		
	Marginal farmer	1	1.25
	Small farmers	23	28.75
	Semi-medium farmers	40	50.00
	Medium farmers	16	20.00
	Big farmers	00	00
4.	Area under irrigation		
	Low	10	12.50
	Medium	60	75.00
	High	10	12.50
5.	Family size		
	Low	4	5.00
	Medium	64	80.00
	High	12	15.00
6.	Social participation		
	Low	70	87.50
	Medium	09	11.25
	High	01	01.25
7.	Extension contact		
	Low	22	27.50
	Medium	42	52.50
	High	16	20.00
8.	Economic motivation		
	Low	21	26.25
	Medium	42	52.50
	High	17	21.25
9.	Risk preferences		
	Low	09	11.25
	Medium	51	63.75
	High	20	25.00

followed by 26.25 per cent of the beneficiaries were educated upto secondary school level, while 50.00 per cent of the beneficiaries were having semi-medium land holding, whereas 75.00 per cent of the beneficiaries were having medium area under irrigation. While 80.00 per

cent of the beneficiaries were having medium family size. It was also found that 87.50 per cent of the beneficiaries were having medium social participation, whereas 52.50 per cent of the beneficiaries were having medium level of extension contact, and 52.50 per cent of the

Table 2 : Constraints faced by the beneficiaries in impact of farm pond			(n=80)	
Sr. No.	Constraints	No.	Per cent	
1.	Lack of proper leadership	42	52.50	
2.	Lack of co-operation	30	37.50	
3.	Increased labour wages	53	66.25	
4.	Lack of contact with extension personnel	10	12.50	
5.	Yearly working of scheme	02	2.50	
6.	Subsidy only after registration of orchard	04	5.00	
7.	Problem in collecting documents	12	15.00	
8.	Lenthy time required for completing procedure	37	46.25	
9.	unavailability of loan	32	40.00	
10.	Unavailability of labour or J.C.B.	56	70.00	
11.	More cost for J.C.B. than labour	51	63.75	
12.	Untimely availability of fund after providing documents	14	17.50	
13.	Fund on cash or in bank account	20	25.00	
14.	Presence of agriculture assistant for taking photo	44	55.00	
15.	Application of polythene paper in farm pond	13	16.25	

beneficiaries were having medium level of economic motivation, followed by 63.75 per cent of the beneficiaries were having medium risk preferences. It is concluded that major constraints faced by beneficiaries were unavailability of labour or J.C.B., increased labour wages, more cost for J.C.B. than labour, presence of agriculture assistant for taking photo, lack of proper leadership, lenthy time required for completing procedure, unavailability of loan, lack of co-operation, untimely availability of fund after providing documents, application of polythene paper in farm pond, fund on cash or in bank account, problem in collecting documents, contact with extension personnel, problem of subsidy only after registration of orchard and yearly working of scheme.

Authors' affiliations :

D.V. SUPE AND G.S. PAWAR, Department of Extension Education, College of Agriculture, Vasantrya Marathwada Krishi Vidyapeeth, PARBHANI (M.S.) INDIA

REFERENCES

- Ahire, R.D.** (2000). A study on the consequences of watershed development programme. Ph.D. Thesis, Marathwada Agriculture University, Parbhani (M.S.) India.
- Deshmukh, K.U.** (2016). Impact of national Watershed Development programme on its beneficiaries in Marathwada region. Ph.D. (Ag.) Thesis, Vasantrya Naik Marathwada Krishi Vidyapeeth, Parbhani (M.S.) India.
- Kulkarni, S.B.** (2009). Impact of Watershed development programme of beneficiaries. M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis, Vasantrya Naik Marathwada Krishi Vidyapeeth, Parbhani (M.S.) India.
- Mankar, D.M., Wankhade, P.P. and Kale, N.M.** (2014). Socio-economic Impact of Improved Soybean Technology on Farmers. *Internat. J. Extn. Educ.*, **10**: 146-152.
- Nipani, S.S.** (2006). Impact of watershed development programme on beneficiaries in Osmanabad district. M.Sc. (Agri.) Thesis, Marathwada Agriculture University, Parbhani (M.S.) India.
- Shivanappan, R.K.** (2005). Impact Assessment of watershed Development Work in ground water recharge. *Kissan world*, **32** (3) : 35-36.
- Thakur, D.R., Pathania, M.S. and Thakur, R.K.** (2014). Impact analysis of integrated watershed project in Swan satchment, Una district of Himachal Pradesh. Department of Agricultural Economics, Extension Education & Rural Sociology College of Agriculture, CSK HPKV, Palampur Research Report: 70 pp.

12th
Year
★ ★ ★ ★ ★ of Excellence ★ ★ ★ ★ ★