

International Journal of Agriculture Sciences ISSN: 0975-3710&E-ISSN: 0975-9107, Volume 8, Issue 21, 2016, pp.-1366-1368. Available online at http://www.bioinfopublication.org/jouarchive.php?opt=&jouid=BPJ0000217

# **INFORMATION NEEDS OF POTATO GROWERS**

# PANCHASARA B.R.1\*, NINAMA A.P.2, PATEL J.B.3 AND PATEL B.M.4

<sup>1</sup>Krishi Vigyan Kendra, Anand Agricultural University, Arnej.

<sup>2,3,4</sup>Department of Extension Education, B A College of Agriculture, Anand Agricultural University, Anand - 388110, Gujarat, India \*Corresponding Author: Email-brpanchasara@aau.in

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

Abstract- The present investigation was undertaken in Anand district of Gujarat State in 2014-2015. Three Talukas were selected purposively because of large area and more number of potato growers is available. From each of the selected Talukas, 4 villages having large area under potato cultivation were selected purposively. Thus, total twelve villages were selected for the study. From each village ten potato growing farmers were randomly selected for the study. Thus, 120 potato growers were selected for the study. The findings revealed that according of information needs hierarchy, plant protection measures which ranked first with 41.68 average mean per cent score of information needs, followed by harvesting and post harvesting technology ranked second (38.82) average mean per cent score), fertilizer management ranked third (38.68 average mean per cent score), respectively. Whereas land preparation and sowing ranked eighth (28.48) average mean per cent score) and supportive fact ranked ninth (19.76 average mean per cent score).

Keywords-Information needs, Potato grower.

Citation: Panchasara B.R., et al., (2016) Information Needs of Potato Growers. International Journal of Agriculture Sciences, ISSN: 0975-3710 & E-ISSN: 0975-9107, Volume 8, Issue 21, pp.-1366-1368.

**Copyright:** Copyright©2016 Panchasara B.R., et al., This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

#### Introduction

Potato is one of the important tuber crops in India. Importance of potato as vegetable in the human diet has been well recognized. It has viewed in general a common man's food. The potato produces more food per unit area than wheat, paddy and many other cereals and that in much shorter time. It is also excellent in nutritive value and palatability. It is a nourishing article of diet of human being. The total area, production and productivity of the potato crop in India and Gujarat look impressive, but it is grossly misleading in comparison with world's potato productivity, as the average productivity of potato of our country (22.74 t/ha) and Gujarat state (30.75 t/ha) and world (33.72 t/ha) is lower than potential productivity. The scope to increase productivity of potato to its potential would substantiate the need for promotion of potato cultivation technology in the farmers, particularly on sustainable agricultural productivity with sustainable and judicious use of monitoring and non-monitoring inputs, related to potato cultivation technology.

Over and above the diverse situation prevailing in the field as well as amongst the farmers to purchase the inputs and non-availability of trustworthy inputs in time, high cost of purchased inputs and un-assured outcome from the farming and above all, the technologies that can be used by them are either not known to them at the time they need it or they need. This requires information management and its dissemination, training for knowledge and skill up gradation, which provide a platform for discussing, debating and making trial of the idea and issues, etc. In addition to this mass dissemination of information is also more important in view of its larger area coverage. Therefore, to bridge the gap between potential productivity and actual productivity some scientific information regarding potato cultivation is needed on part of potato growers.

### Objectives

- 1. To study the profile of the potato growers.
- 2. To ascertain the level of information needs of potato growers.

3. To study the relationship between the profile of potato growers and their information needs.

## **MaterialsandMethods**

The present investigation was undertaken in Anand district of Gujarat State. Eight Talukas were selected purposively and from each of the selected Talukas, 4 villages having large area under potato were selected purposively. Thus, total twelve villages were selected for the study. From each village ten potato growing farmers were randomly selected for the study. Thus, 120 potato growers were selected for the study.

#### Statistical analysis

Data were collected by personnel interview and statistical tools like frequency distribution, per cent, mean and arbitrary method for categorization was used for the study.

## Result

#### Background information of the respondents

The respondents were categorized into different groups on the basis of their personal, economical, social, communicational and psychological characteristics i.e. age, education, mass media, social participation, economic motivation, total land under cotton cultivation and size of land holding. The same has been presented in the [Table-1].

The data presented in [Table-1] revealed that more than half (56.67 per cent) of the potato growers belonged to middle age group. Slightly more than one-third (41.66 per cent) of the potato growers were graduate and above level of education. Slightly more than one-third (40.83 per cent) of the potato growers had a high level of experience in potato cultivation. Slightly less than half (49.17 per cent) of potato growers had membership in one organization. Slightly more than one third (41.67 per cent) of the potato growers had medium size of land holding. Less than one-third (35.84 per cent) of potato growers had an annual income

International Journal of Agriculture Sciences ISSN: 0975-3710&E-ISSN: 0975-9107, Volume 8, Issue 21, 2016 ranging from 1.1 to 2 lakh rupees. More than one-third (43.34 per cent) of the potato growers were having high levels of extension contacts. Slightly more than one-third (40.84 per cent) of the potato growers had a high level of mass media exposure. Slightly more than one-third (40.84 per cent) of the potato growers belongs to a high economic motivation category. More than one-third (40.83 per

cent) of the potato growers had a high level of market orientation. Slightly less than half (48.34 per cent) of the potato growers were found with high level of scientific orientation. Less than half (47.50 per cent) of the potato growers had a high level of risk orientation.

	Table-1 Con	nponent of potato growers	n=120	
Sr. No.	Components	Categories	Frequency (No.)	Percentage (%)
		Young age ( up to 40 years)	12	10.00
1	Δαe	Middle age (40 to 50 years) Old age (more than	68	56.67
1.	Age		40	22.22
		50) Tatal	40	100.00
		Iotal	120	100.00
		Illiterate	06	05.00
2.	Education	Primary education(Up to 7th standard)	16	13.33
		Secondary education (8th to 10th standard)	20	16.67
		Higher secondary education (11th to 12th standard)	28	23.34
		Graduate and above	50	41.66
		Total	120	100.00
3	Experience in potato cultivation	Low (up to 5 years)	27	22.50
э.	Experience in polato cultivation	Medium (6 to 10 years)	11	36.67
		High (chour 10 years)	40	10.07
			49	40.00
		Iotal	120	100.00
4.	Social participation	No membership in any organization	20	16.67
		Membership in one organization	59	49.17
		Membership in more than one organizations	31	25.83
		Position holder in any organization	10	08.33
		Total	120	100.00
5.	Total area of land	Marginal farmer (Up to 1 hectare)	16	13 33
•		Small farmer (1 01 to 2 hectare)	23	19 17
		Medium farmer( 01 to 4 hectare)	50	/1.67
		Lerge fermer (>4 hectore)	21	11.07
			400	20.00
			120	100.00
6.	Annual income	Up to < 1,00,000	22	18.33
		≤1,00,001 to ≤2,00,000	43	35.84
		₹2,00,001 to ₹3,00,000	25	20.83
		₹3,00,001 to ₹4,00,000	12	10.00
		Above <b>₹</b> 4,00,000	18	15.00
		Total	120	100.00
7.	Extension contact	Very Low (0 to 2.0)	07	05.83
		$L_{ow}$ (2.1 to 4.0 score)	25	20.83
		Medium (4.1 to 6.0score)	33	27.50
		High (6.1 to 8.0score)	52	13.34
		Von High (9.1 to 10000re)	02	40.04
		very high (o. 1 to toscore)	00	02.30
		I otal	120	100.00
8.	Mass Media Exposure	Very low (Up to 2.4 score)	04	03.33
		Low (2.41 to 4.80 score)	20	16.67
		Medium (4.81 to 7.20 score)	40	33.33
		High (7.21 to 9.60 score)	49	40.84
		Very high (9.61 to 12 score)	07	05.83
		Total	120	100.00
9.	Economic motivation	Very Low (Up to 10.80 score)	02	01.67
-		Low (10 81 to 15 60 score)	20	16 67
		Medium (15.61 to 20.40 score)	36	30.00
		High (20.41 to 25.20 score)	49	40.84
		Von High (Above 25.20 score)	13	10.82
		Total	10	10.02
40	Maulust autostiau		00	00.00
10.	Market orientation	Very Low (Up to 14.40 score)	00	00.00
		Low (14.41 to 20.80 score)	02	01.67
		Medium (20.81 to 27.20 score)	44	36.67
		High (27.21 to 33.60 score)	49	40.83
		Very High (Above 33.60 score)	25	20.83
		Total	120	100.00
11.	Scientific orientation	Very Low (Up to 25.20 score)	00	00.00
		Low (25.21 to 36.40 score)	04	03.33
		Medium (36 41 to 47 60 score)	42	35.00
		High (47.61 to 58.80 score)	58	18 34
		Ven/ High (Above 58.90 sector)	16	12 22
			10	10.00
L			120	100.00
12.	Risk orientation	Very Low (Up to 18 score)	00	00.00
		Low (19 to 26 score)	05	04.16
		Medium (27 to 34 score)	49	40.84
		High (35 to 42 score)	57	47.50
		Very High (Above 42 score)	09	07.50
		Total	120	100.00

Aspect wise overall Information needs of Potato growers.

From the result in [Table-2] it can be observed that according of information needs

hierarchy, plant protection measures which ranked first with 41.68 average mean per cent score of information needs, followed by harvesting and post harvesting technology ranked second (38.82 average mean per cent score), fertilizer management ranked third (38.68 average mean per cent score), marketing ranked fourth (38.48 average mean per cent score), variety ranked fifth (32.81 average mean per cent score), water management ranked sixth (30.60 average mean per cent score), weed management ranked seventh (29.06 average mean per cent score), land preparation and sowing ranked eighth (28.48 average mean per cent score) and supportive fact ranked ninth (19.76 average mean per cent score).

Table-2 Distribution of the potato growers according to their aspect wise overall information needs         n=120					
Sr. no. (A)	Major aspects (B)	Sub aspects (C)	Total mean per cent (D)	Average mean per cent score(E=D/C)	Rank (F)
1	Variety	4	131.25	32.81	V
2	Land preparation & sowing	8	227.91	24.48	VIII
3	Fertilizer management	6	232.08	36.68	III
4	Weed management and inter-culturing	4	116.27	29.06	VII
5	Water management	5	153.00	30.60	VI
6	Plant protection measures	11	458.52	41.68	
7	Harvesting and post harvesting technology	6	232.92	38.82	I
8	Marketing	6	230.90	38.48	IV
9	Supportive facts	5	098.83	19.76	IX

**Overall information needs** From the fleeting look of [Table-3] we can conclude that more than one-third of the potato growers (36.67 per cent) fell under low level of information needs group, followed by 30.83 per cent, 23.33 per cent and 09.17 per cent of potato growers were categorized under very low, medium and high respectively. While none of them was in the category of very high level of information needs group.

 Table-3 Distribution of the potato growers according to their overall information needs
 n=120

Sr. No.	Cotogony	Respo	Respondents		
	Galegoly	Frequency	Per cent		
1	Very Low (00.00 to 20.00 %)	37	30.83		
2	Low (20.01 to 40.00 %)	44	36.67		
3	Medium (40.01 to 60.00 %)	28	23.33		
4	High (60.01 to 80.00 %)	11	09.17		
5	Very High (80.01 to 100.00 %)	00	00.00		
	Total	120	100.00		

# Conclusion

From the above discussion in case of overall information needs, it could be concluded that one-third of the potato growers (36.67 per cent) fell under low level of information needs group, followed by 30.83 per cent, 23.33 per cent and 09.17 per cent of potato growers were categorized under very low, medium and high respectively. While none of them was in the category of very high level of information needs group. From the above results further it could be concluded that according of information needs hierarchy, plant protection measures which ranked first with 41.68 average mean per cent score of information needs, followed by harvesting and post harvesting technology ranked second (38.82 average mean per cent score), fertilizer management ranked third (38.68 average mean per cent score), marketing ranked fourth (38.48 average mean per cent score), variety ranked fifth (32.81 average mean per cent score), water management ranked sixth (30.60 average mean per cent score), weed management ranked seventh (29.06 average mean per cent score), land preparation and sowing ranked eighth (28.48 average mean per cent score) and supportive fact ranked ninth with 19.76 average mean per cent score

## Conflict of Interest: None declared

# References

 Badhe D.K. (2009) A study on adoption of recommended production technology of brinjal by brinjal growers in Anand district of Gujarat state. M.Sc. (Agri.), Thesis (Unpublished), A.A.U., Anand.

- [2] Meera S.N., Jhamtani A. and Rao D. (2003) A analysis of agricultural information communication technology project in india: implication to the Agricultural extension system. National workshop on ICT agriculture and rural development DA-11 CT, Gandhinagar during 18th\_19th December, 2003.
- [3] Pareek U. and Trivedi G. (1963) Rural India, 30, 311-323.
- [4] Pawar S.P., Sawant P.A. and Nirban A.J. (2001) Maha. J. Extn. Edu., XX, pp: 53-55.
- [5] Srivastava B.N. and Hari K. (1979) Some economic aspects of potato production and utilization in India. Paper presented at Symp.post harvest technology. Utilize potato. New Delhi
- [6] Sharma Gayatri (2008) A study on adoption of improved technology of papaya growers in Anand district of Gujarat state. M.Sc. (Agri.), Thesis (Unpublished), A.A.U., Anand campus, Anand.
- [7] Vaidehi M.P. and Sunanda P.K. (1982) Journal of Indian Potato Association, 9(1), 21-27.