International Journal of Agriculture Sciences
ISSN: 0975-3710&E-ISSN: 0975-9107, Volume 8, Issue 22, 2016, pp.-1419-1422.
Available online at http://www.bioinfopublication.org/jouarchive.php?opt=&jouid=BPJ0000217

KNOWLEDGE OF FARMERS ABOUT KISAN CALL CENTER

PARMAR V.S.*, BHUVA R.M., CHAREL J.M. AND SHARMA O.P.

Department of Extension Education, N. M. College of Agriculture, Navsari Agricultural University, Navsari, Gujarat 396450
*Corresponding Author: Email-vparmar801@gmail.com

Received: April 09, 2016; Revised: April 15, 2016; Accepted: April 16, 2016

Abstract- The concept of Kisan Call Centers (KCCs) was a logical outcome of the commitment by the Government of India to leverage the ICT for overcoming the constraints of distance and time in providing new generation extension services to the farmers. The farmer may come across a number information sources but they pursue only few of them depending upon the availability and the ease of use. The present study was conducted in South Gujarat region. All the districts were selected for the present study. The data were collected with help of well-structured interview schedule following personal interview methods. It was found that majority of the respondents 61.5 per cent had medium level of knowledge about the Kisan Call Center, while 28.00 per cent of respondents had low and 10.50 per cent of respondents had high level of Kisan Call Center, respectively. It also found that annual income, extension contact, source of information, scientific orientation were found significantly and education, innovativeness and social participation were highly significantly correlated with the knowledge of the respondents about Kisan Call Center.

Keywords- Kisan Call Center, Knowledge, communication, ICT, Caller Farmers.

Citation: Parmar V. S., et al., (2016) Knowledge of Farmers about Kisan Call Center. International Journal of Agriculture Sciences, ISSN: 0975-3710 & E-ISSN: 0975-9107, Volume 8, Issue 22, pp.-1419-1422.

Introduction

Use improved technology is one of the most important thing for farmers to improve productivity sustainably. Innovative extension approaches for transfer of technology are requisite to get appropriate apparatus, knowledge to the farmer. ICTs are most natural allies to facilitate the outreach of agricultural extension system in the country. The policy framework for agricultural extension highlights the opportunity for information and communication technology (ICT) to improve the quality and accelerate the transfer and exchange of information to farmers, and ICT is consequently given a high priority, particularly as a tool for improving the marketing aspects of farm enterprises. Indian telecommunication revolution that too wireless connectivity made it possible to reach to unreachable located consumers through help line Services. The telephone has just started to make its presence felt on this scenario. The concept of Kisan Call Centers (KCCs) was a logical outcome of the commitment by the Government of India to leverage the ICT for overcoming the constraints of distance and time in providing new generation extension services to the farmers. The farmer may come across a number information sources but they pursue only few of them depending upon the availability and the ease of use. Countering the importance and facts in view the present study was under taken with the following specific objectives.

1. To study the socio-personal, economic, psychological and communication characteristics of the caller farmers.
2. To find out the knowledge level of farmers about the Kisan Call Center.
3. To ascertain the relationship between profile of farmers & their knowledge level about Kisan Call Center.

Material and Methods

The present study was undertaken in South Gujarat. A list of farmers of Navsari, Valsad, Tapi, Narmada, Dang, Surat and Bharuch who had contacted Kisan Call Center (KCC), Ahmedabad through landline or mobile phone during 1st Jan – 2013 to 31st Dec 2013 was obtained from the Kisan Call Center (KCC), Ahmedabad. Out of these 200 farmers were selected with the help of proportionate random sampling method. Ex post facto research design was used for the study. The SES scale developed by Pareek and Trivedi (1963) was used with due modification for measuring family size, occupation, land holding, social participation and annual income. The Scale developed by Supe (1969) was used with due modification for measurement risk and scientific orientation. The Scale developed by Singh (1977) was used with due modification for measurement innovativeness of the respondents. To know the education, extension contact, source of information, knowledge of farmers about KCC a structured schedule was developed. Knowledge of the respondents about the Kisan Call Center was measured by computing the knowledge score. In all twenty-two statements in respect Kisan Call Center were prepared with the help of experts from the KCC and Extension discipline. If farmer has given "YES" answer to any sub-questions under the head, the "TWO" score was given and "ONE" score was given for those who had given "NO" answer. The respondents were grouped into three levels of knowledge by using mean and standard deviation.

Sr. No.	Category	Range
1.	Low level knowledge	$\leq \bar{X}$ - S.D.
2.	Medium level knowledge	In between $\bar{X} \pm$ S.D.
3.	High level knowledge	$\geq \bar{X}$ + S.D.

The data was collected with the help of well-structured, pre-tested, Gujarati version interview scheduled through personal contact and data were compiled, tabulated and analyzed to get answer of the study.

Result and Discussion

The data related to distribution of the respondents according to socio-personal, economic, psychological and communication characteristics [Table-1].

Age

The data presented in [Table-1] shows that 55.00 per cent of the respondents

Table-1 *Distribution of respondents according to socio-personal, economic, psychological and communication characteristics*

Sr. No.	Particular variable		N=200
1.	**Age**	**Frequency**	**Per cent**
	Young age group (up to 30 years)	52	26.00
	Middle age group (between 31 to 50 years)	110	55.00
	Old age group (above 50 years)	38	19.00
	Total	**200**	**100**
2.	**EDUCATION**		
	Illiterate	2	1.00
	Primary (1st to 7th standard)	23	11.50
	Secondary (8th to 10th standard)	54	27.00
	Higher secondary (11th to 12th standard)	54	27.00
	Graduate and above (above 12th std.)	67	33.50
	Total	**200**	**100**
3.	**SIZE OF FAMILY**		
	Small size (up to 4 members)	66	33.00
	Large size (above 4 members)	134	67.00
	Total	**200**	**100**
4.	**SIZE OF LAND HOLDING**		
	Marginal farmers (up to 1.00 ha)	44	22.00
	Small farmers (1.01 to 2.00 ha)	61	30.50
	Medium farmers (2.01 to 3.00 ha)	46	23.00
	Large farmers (More than 3.00 ha)	49	24.50
	Total	**200**	**100**
5.	**OCCUPATION**		
	Farming only	16	8.00
	Farming + Service	50	25.00
	Farming + Business	62	31.00
	Farming + Service + Business	72	36.00
	Total	**200**	**100**
6.	**ANNUAL INCOME**		
	up to Rs. 1,00,000/-	112	56.00
	Rs. 1,00,001 to 2,00,000/-	50	25.00
	Above Rs. 2,00,000/-	38	19.00
	Total	**200**	**100**
7.	**INNOVATIVENESS**		
	Low Innovativeness	44	22.00
	Medium Innovativeness	71	35.50
	High Innovativeness	85	42.50
	Total	**200**	**100**
8.	**EXTENSION CONTACT**		
	Low contact	47	23.50
	Medium contact	118	59.00
	High contact	35	17.50
	Total	**200**	**100**
9.	**SOCIAL PARTICIPATION**		
	No membership	71	35.50
	Membership in one organization	83	41.50
	Membership in more than one organizations	23	11.50
	Holding position in organization	23	11.50
	Total	**200**	**100**
10.	**SOURCE OF INFORMATION**		
	Low utilization of information sources	37	18.50
	Medium utilization of information sources	132	66.00
	High utilization of information sources	31	15.50
	Total	**200**	**100**
11.	**SCIENTIFIC ORIENTATION**		
	Low scientific orientation	32	16.00
	Medium scientific orientation	128	64.00
	High scientific orientation	40	20.00
	Total	200	100
12.	**RISK ORIENTATION**		
	Low risk orientation	32	16.00
	Medium risk orientation	121	60.50
	High risk orientation	47	23.50
	Total	**200**	**100**

were found in middle age group, whereas 26.00 per cent and 19 per cent of them were in the young age group and old age group, respectively.

Education

The data in the [Table-1] reported that 33.00 per cent of the respondents had graduate and above education followed by 27.00 per cent, 27.00 per cent and 11.50 per cent of them had higher secondary education, secondary education and primary level of education, respectively. Only 1.00 per cent of the respondents were illiterate.

Size of family

The data presented in [Table-1] observed that majority of the respondents (67.00

per cent) were from large family whereas, only 33.00 per cent of them were from small family.

Size of land holding
The data presented in [Table-1] shows that 30.50 per cent of the respondents had small land holding, followed by 24.5 per cent, 23 per cent and 22 per cent who had large level, medium level and marginal level land holding, respectively.

Occupation
The data presented in [Table-1] indicates that 36.00 per cent of the respondents were engaged in farming with service and business whereas, 31.00 per cent and 25.00 per cent of the respondents were engaged in farming with business and farming with service, respectively. Only 8.00 per cent of the respondents were engaged in farming activities.

Annual income
The data presented in the [Table-1] that indicates 56.00 per cent of the respondents earning annual income up to 1,00,000/- followed by 25.00 per cent and 19.00 per cent of them who were having annual income in between Rs. 1,00,001 to 2,00,000/- and above Rs.2,00,000/- , respectively.

Innovativeness
The data presented in the [Table-1] indicated that 42.5 per cent of the respondents had high of level innovativeness, followed by 35.5 per cent and 22.00 per cent who had medium level and low level innovativeness, respectively.

Extension contact
The data presented in the [Table-1] indicated that 59.00 per cent of the respondents had medium level of extension contact with different extension agencies, followed by 23.50 per cent and 17.50 per cent who had low and high extension contacts, respectively.

Social participation
The data presented in [Table-1] show that 41.50 per cent of the respondents had membership at least in one organization. Whereas, 35.50 per cent of the respondent had no membership in any organization while equal percentage 11.50 per cent of the respondent had Membership in more than one organization and holding position in organization, respectively.

Sources of information
The data presented in [Table-1] revealed that majority of the respondents (66.00 per cent) had used sources of information with medium level with different media, agricultural university and extension agencies whereas, less than one fifth (18.5 per cent) and more than one tenth (15.50 per cent) of them had used the sources of information at low and high levels, respectively.

Scientific orientation
The data presented in [Table-1] indicated that majority of the respondents (64.00 per cent) had medium level of scientific orientation. About 20.00 per cent of respondents had high level of scientific orientation and rest 16.00 per cent had low level of scientific orientation.

Risk orientation
The data reported in [Table-1] shows that majority of the respondents (60.50 per cent) had medium level of risk orientation followed by high and low level risk orientation with 23.50 per cent and 16.00 per cent of the respondents, respectively.
These findings are similar to the findings reported by [1-8, 10-12, 15-17].

Knowledge of caller farmers about the Kisan Call Center
The data related to distribution of the respondents according to their knowledge level about the Kisan Call Center [Table-2].

The data presented in the data presented in the [Table-2] shows that majority of the respondents (61.5 per cent) had medium level of knowledge about the Kisan Call Center, while 28.00 per cent of respondents had low and 10.50 per cent of respondents had high level of Kisan Call Center, respectively.
The findings are similar to the findings reported by [13,14].

Table-2 *Distribution of the respondents according to their knowledge level about the Kisan Call Center*

Sr. No.	Level of Knowledge	Frequency	Per cent
1.	Low level knowledge	56	28.00
2.	Medium level knowledge	123	61.50
3.	High level knowledge	21	10.50
Total		**200**	**100**
Mean=37.14			S.D. =3.74

Relationship between profile of the Caller farmers with their knowledge about Kisan Call Center
The data pertaining to the relationship between the profile of the respondents and their knowledge about Kisan Call Center are presented in [Table-3].
The data in this regard presented in [Table-3] clearly revealed that education (0.5854), innovativeness (0.4886) and social participation (0.2084) are highly significantly correlated at 0.01 level of probability with the knowledge about Kisan Call Center.

Table-3 *Relationship between profile of the respondents with their knowledge about Kisan Call Center*

n=200

Sr. No.	Independent Variables	Correlation Coefficient ('r' value)
1.	Age	-0.1526*
2.	Education	0.5854**
3.	Family size	-0.1069^{NS}
4.	Land holding	0.0073^{NS}
5.	Occupation	-0.0782^{NS}
6.	Annual income	0.1722*
7.	Innovativeness	0.4886**
8.	Extension contact	0.1391*
9.	Social participation	0.2084**
10.	Source of information	0.1619*
11.	Scientific orientation	0.1816*
12.	Risk orientation	0.01204^{NS}

Note: - * Significant at 0.05 level, ** Significant at 0.01 level, NS Non significant

Annual income (0.1722), extension contact (0.1391), source of information (0.1619) and scientific orientation (0.1816) are found significantly correlated at 0.05 level of probability with the knowledge about Kisan Call Center. Only age (-0.1526) was negatively but significantly correlated with the knowledge about Kisan Call Center.
However, the land holding (0.0073^{NS}) and risk orientation (0.01204^{NS}) are positively and non-significantly correlated with knowledge about Kisan Call Center. Whereas, family size (-0.1069^{NS}) and occupation (-0.0782^{NS}) are negatively and non-significantly correlated with knowledge about Kisan Call Center. Thus, it accepts the null hypothesis. So it can be concluded that family size and occupation are not influence the knowledge level of the respondents about Kisan Call Center.
The findings are similar to the findings reported by [9,18]

Conclusion
It can be concluded from the above results that majority of the respondents were from large family, medium level of source of information, medium level of scientific orientation, medium level of risk orientation. It also be concluded that majority of the respondents were educated, earning up to Rs.1, 00,000/- to Rs.2, 00,000 annual income and had membership at least in one organization and high to medium level of innovativeness. Further, majority of the respondents had medium level of knowledge about Kisan Call Center. Among all independent variable

annual income, extension contact, source of information, scientific orientation were found significantly and education, innovativeness and social participation were highly significantly correlated with the knowledge of the respondents about Kisan Call Center.

Conflict of Interest: None declared

References

[1] Adhiguru P. and Devi S. V. (2012) *International J. of Extn. Edu*., 8, 1-4.
[2] Ajotikar M. V., Shinde S. B. and Nirban A. J. (2010) *Asian J. Extn. Edu.,* 28, 87-92.
[3] Arora S. and Rathore S. (2013) *J. of Global Communication,* 6(1), 64-68.
[4] Bhatt P. M. (2006) *Ph.D. (Agri.),* Thesis (unpublished), AAU, Anand.
[5] Bhosle P. B., Jondhale S. G. and Kadam R. P (2008) Agrotech Publishing Academy, Udaipur, 19-27.
[6] Bhosle P. B., Jondhale S.G. and Patil B. (2000) *Maharashtra J. Extn. Edu*., 7, 28-31.
[7] Das A., Basu D. and Goswami R. (2012). *Indian Res. J. Ext. Edu*., 12(3), 102-107.
[8] Ganesan M., Karthikeyan K., Prashant S. and Umadikar J. (2013). *J. of Agri. Exten. & Rural Development*, 5(4), 89-99.
[9] Kaur R. and Rathore R. (2013) Extension Educational Strategies for sustainable Agricultural Development-A Global perspective, University of Agricultural Sciences, Bangalore, India.
[10] Michael T. A. (2003) *J. Extn. System.,* 19, 45-53.
[11] Mwakaje A. G. (2010) *J. of Information Technology Impact*. 10(2), 111-128.
[12] Patil B. N. and Kulkarni B. R. (1992) *Maha. J. of Extn. Edu*., XI: 108-111.
[13] Pawar J.B., Badiger C.A. and Hiremath U.S. (2011) *Karnataka J. Agric. Sci.,* 24(4), 516-519 .
[14] Rudroju V. and Angadi,J. G. (2013) *Karnataka J. Agric. Sci*., 26(3): 460.
[15] Sashidara K.K., Manjunath L., Hireven V., Katarki P. K and Hanchinal S. N. (2007) *souvenir abstract,* 256.
[16] Sharnagat P. M. (2008) M.Sc (Agri.),Thesis (Unpublished), Akola (M.S).
[17] Sunil B., Rajmane C., Ahire R. P. and Gawande P. (2009) *J. C. S*., 27, 46-52.
[18] Tiwari N. and Upadhyay R. (2011) *Raj. J. Extn. Edu.,* 19, 10-14.