

Evaluating Community Development Programmes: A Case Study of Hosangady Village

SAPNA

Research Scholar

Mangalore University, Mangalore (Karnataka) India

Key Words : Evaluating community Development programmes, Community of Hosangady

INTRODUCTION

Hosangadi is a village in the Indian state of Karnataka, situated in the Beltangadi taluka of the Dakshina Kannada district. It is located 70 kilometers from the district headquarters in Mangalore and 22 km from the sub-district headquarters in Beltangady. The village's entire land area is 1063.96 hectares. There are 3,366 people living in Hosangadi overall, of which 1,637 are men and 1,729 are women. Hosangadi Village has a 72.70% literacy rate, with 77.34% of men and 68.31% of women being literate. A little over 702 homes make up Hosangadi Village.

The community of Hosangady is representative of many rural areas that struggle with issues including poverty, lack of access to essential services, and little prospects for employment. Over the years, Hosangady has undertaken a number of community development programmes in response to these difficulties. These initiatives cover a broad spectrum of interventions, such as infrastructure development, capacity building, livelihood support, healthcare, and education. Even after these community development initiatives have been put into place, there is still a lack of knowledge on their efficacy and how they affect the lives of those who reside in Hosangady village.

Thus, the purpose of this study is to advance our knowledge of community development initiatives and their efficacy with the residents of Hosangady Village. Through a comprehensive analysis of the experiences, perceptions, and results of these programmes from the viewpoints of community people, politicians, and implementing agencies, this study aims to pinpoint the most significant obstacles, valuable insights, and optimal methodologies that can guide future interventions and policy choices.

Objectives of the Study:

1. To identify the various governmental community development programs implemented

How to cite this Article: Sapna (2015). Evaluating Community Development Programmes: A Case Study of Hosangady Village. *Internat. J. Appl. Soc. Sci.*, 2 (11&12) : 408-411.

by Grama Panchayat Hosanagady.

2. To understand the different programmes introduced by community based organization in Hosanagady village.

3. To find out the effectiveness of community development programs in Hosanagadi village.

4. To develop suggestive measures to improve the effectiveness of community development programs in Hosangady village.

Sampling Method And Sample Size:

In the research study focused on community development programs' effectiveness in Hosangady village, 25 participants were randomly selected through the simple random sampling method. This method ensures every individual in the village has an equal chance of being chosen for the study, thus minimizing bias. By selecting a representative sample, researchers aim to accurately assess the impact and effectiveness of community development initiatives on the residents of Hosangady village.

Method of Data Collection:

Researchers collected data for their study on the effectiveness of community development activities in Hosangady Village using both primary and secondary methodologies. The principal techniques comprised gathering primary data directly from the individuals through interviews. Secondary methods comprised compiling pre-existing data from places including public records, scholarly journals, and government reports.

Analysis and Interpretation:

Educational Qualification of the respondents:

As it comes to the respondents' educational backgrounds, the majority, or 44%, only has a 10th grade education. A mere 28 percent of respondents had completed lower primary school, while 24% had completed post-secondary education. Only 4% of those surveyed have completed their degree.

Occupational distribution of respondents:

Majority *i.e.*, 10 respondents (40 %) are daily wage earners, 20 % (5) the respondents are house wives where as 20 % of the respondents are unemployed and another 20% are housewives. It also shows that the remaining respondents are into beedi rolling, driving and into painting.

Availability of Ration Card:

The ration card availability is depicted in the above chart, which indicates that 96% of respondents have access to ration cards, while the other 4% do not

Availability of PAN card:

The availability of PAN card is depicted in the above graph, which indicates that 84% of respondents have PAN cards with them while 16% do not.

Rural Drinking water and Sanitation Programme:

The availability of rural drinking water and the sanitation programme are displayed in the above chart. The majority of respondents, or 72%, concurred that rural communities have access to drinking water and a sanitation programme. The other 28% are not aware of it.

Samagra Shiksha Abhiyan:

Samagra Shiksha Abhiyan awareness is demonstrated in the about chart, which indicates that 68% of respondents are aware that Samagra Shiksha Abhiyan is available, while 32% are not.

Findings:

The vast majority of respondents in this study *i.e.*, 64 per cent are female, and only 36 percent are male.

Of the total respondents, 44% were between the ages of 40 and 60. The majority of the sample used for the research consisted of middle-aged respondents.

The majority, or 44%, only completed the tenth grade. Just 4% of respondents to the study have finished their graduation.

The majority of respondents *i.e.*, 12 or 24% of the sample are housewives. The remaining respondents consist of daily wage earners, few are into driving, painting, working in fish markets, beedi rolling, and driving.

There were few respondents who were unemployed. Of the total population, 88% are married, with 12% being single. The two main religious groups represented in this study are the majority of respondents (64%), who identify as Hindu, and 38% of respondents, who identify as Islamic.

Of those surveyed, 96% have access to ration cards, at the same time as 4% do not.

Of the participants, 92% claimed to have a bank account, whilst 8% said they didn't have one.

Eighty per cent of respondents concur that the village offers the MGNREGA programme, whereas twenty per cent do not know about it. While 44% are unaware of the Swatch Bharat mission, 56% are aware that it is available.

Of the population, 44% know of the existence of the Gramavikas Yojana, whereas 66% are unaware of it. A majority of respondents, or 72%, agreed that access to drinking water and a sanitation programmes is available in rural communities. It is unknown to the remaining 28%.

28% of respondents thought the Gandhi Sakshi Kayaka programme was extremely helpful, whereas 72% of the majority of respondents disagreed. 72% of respondents thought the My House-My Road programme was not very helpful, while 28% of respondents felt it was.

Of the respondents, 48% believed that the Suvarna Gramodaya Yojana scheme was beneficial, while 52% disagreed. 32% of respondents disagreed with the 68% of respondents who said the Jala Samvardhane Yojana was useful.

Of those who took part, 64% thought the model home-self sustainable community

initiative was helpful, while 36% did not. While 28% of respondents did not think the SC/ST Individual Benefit plan was useful, 72% of respondents said it was.

Conclusion:

The findings of the research highlight the urgent need for focused actions to remove the structural obstacles preventing marginalised communities' access to necessary paperwork and knowledge about government initiatives.

The results show that a sizable percentage of respondents do not have essential identity documents like bank accounts, PAN cards, or ration cards, which restricts their access to possibilities for financial inclusion and essential services.

In addition, the survey respondents' widespread ignorance of government initiatives underscores a crucial communication barrier between decision-makers and the populations they aim to assist.

Suggestions:

Awareness Campaigns and Informational Workshops can be conducted to educate villagers on the importance and benefits of having ration cards, PAN cards, and bank accounts.

In order to spread knowledge about MGNREGA, the panchayat might host informational sessions and workshops and collaborate with local media and leaders.

Furthermore, residents can be made more aware of the advantages and registration procedure by means of practical demonstrations through support booths and model projects.

Panchayats can promote agriculture development by organizing training sessions on modern farming techniques and sustainable practices, along with providing access to necessary resources and support.

Additionally, they can initiate self-employment training programs that focus on skill development, entrepreneurship, and financial literacy to empower unemployed youth and enhance the community's economic stability.

REFERENCES

- Bhattacharyya, J. (2004). Theorizing Community Development. *Journal of the Community Development Society*, **34**(2) : 5-34. doi:10.1080/15575330409490110.
- Chaskin, R.J., Brown, P., Venkatesh, S. and Vidal, A. (2001). Building Community Capacity. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Craig, G. (2007). Community capacity-building: Something old, something new...? *Critical Social Policy*, **27**(3) : 335-359. doi:10.1177/0261018307078846
- Mansuri, G. and Rao, V. (2004). Community-Based and -Driven Development: A Critical Review. *The World Bank Research Observer*, **19**(1) : 1-39.
- Narayan, D. (1995). The Contribution of People's Participation: Evidence from 121 Rural Water Supply Projects. World Bank.
