



Research Article

PROFILE OF THE ADOPTED AND NON-ADOPTED VILLAGES RESPONDENTS OF FLDS TECHNOLOGY ON PIGEON PEA

KUMBHANI S.R.^{1*}, PATEL B.B.², ZALA J.N.³, BHUVA R.M.⁴, CHANDRAVADIA K.U.⁵ AND CHOVIATIYA J.V.⁶

^{1,2,3}Director of Extension Education, Navsari Agricultural University, Navsari, 396450, Gujarat

⁴Agricultural Technology Information Center, Navsari Agricultural University, Navsari, 396450, Gujarat

⁵College of Agriculture, Jabugam, 391155, Anand Agricultural University, Anand, 388001

⁶College of Agriculture, Khapat, Porbandar, Junagadh Agricultural University, Junagadh, 362001, Gujarat

*Corresponding Author: Email-srkumbhani@nau.in

Received: January 19, 2018; Revised: January 27, 2018; Accepted: January 28, 2018; Published: January 30, 2018

Abstract- Organising "Front Line Demonstrations (FLDs)" on various crops to generate production data and feedback information is one of the mandates of KVKs. The present study was conducted in four randomly selected villages of Narmada district from the list of KVK adopted villages. While four neighboring villages of the adopted one were selected purposively as the Non-adopted village. From each village's ten respondents, thus 80 respondents were randomly selected. It was observed that majority of the respondents were in middle age group, educated up to primary school level, participated in social activities, participated in more than one extension activity, annual income up to Rs.50,000/-, engaged in farming as main occupation, possessed 0.01 – 2.00 ha of land, found to have medium level of economic motivation and found to have medium level of knowledge and adoption of pigeon pea production technology in adopted villages whereas, majority of the respondents were in middle age group, educated up to primary school level, not participated in social activities, participated in more than one extension activity, annual income up to Rs. 50,000/-, engaged in farming as main occupation, possessed 0.01 – 1.00 ha of land and found to have medium level of economic motivation in non-adopted villages.

Keywords- FLD, KVK, Profile of respondents, Farm Science Centre, Adoption.

Citation: Kumbhani S.R., *et al.*, (2018) Profile of the Adopted and Non-Adopted Villages Respondents of FLDs Technology on Pigeon Pea. International Journal of Agriculture Sciences, ISSN: 0975-3710 & E-ISSN: 0975-9107, Volume 10, Issue 2, pp.-5082-5084.

Copyright: Copyright©2018 Kumbhani S.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.

Academic Editor / Reviewer: Bayoukh Chokri, Dr Senthilkumar S., Mukhopadhyay C.S., Belkar Y.K., Dr J M Mayani

Introduction

The lack of transfer of technology from research system to the client system is the main problem in increasing agricultural production in the developing world. Still there is a wide gap exists between attained technical know-how and its utilization in the field of common farmers. The present rate of agricultural production can be doubled if the available Pigeon Pea production technologies are brought to bear with production process and programme. This requires the steady flow of information from the scientist to the farmers. Moreover, inputs are needed to be used scientifically. This is possible through the demonstration as it is an important and appropriate extension method which makes it possible to disseminate technology to the user farmers. Keeping this fact in view, the Government of India launched frontline demonstration programmes for increasing crops production. It has played significant role in increasing the knowledge and adoption of recommended Pigeon Pea production technologies by the Pigeon Pea growers. Keeping in mind, the present study was taken with the objective: To study the personal profile of the respondents.

Methodology

Present study was conducted in the Narmada district of Gujarat State in 2014. Four villages were selected randomly from the list of adopted villages of KVK, while four neighboring villages of the adopted villages were selected purposively as the Non-adopted villages. Ten respondents were selected from the list of demonstration farmers on those fields where FLDs on pigeon pea was conducted

in each adopted village; and non-adopted villages by random sampling technique. Thus, total numbers of respondents were 80. The interview schedule was developed after due consultation with the faculty members of the discipline and the data were collected by the personal interview method. The data so collected were tabulated, analyzed with appropriate statistical tools and interpreted in the light of the objectives.

Findings:

1. Personal profile of the respondents:

The findings of these selected characteristics have been presented in the following section:

1.1 Age

The data presented in [Table-1(1)] shows that more than half (57.50 and 52.50 per cent) of the respondents were in middle age group in adopted and non-adopted villages, respectively, followed by 22.50 and 25.00 per cent of the respondents belongs to old age group in adopted and non-adopted villages, respectively. The findings were similar to the findings reported by [1].

1.2 Education

It is evident from [Table-1(2)] that more than two-third majority (72.50 and 65.00 per cent) of the respondents were educated up to primary school level in adopted and non-adopted villages, respectively. The findings were in agreement with those reported by [1,2,7] & [3].

Table-1 Distribution of respondents according to their personal characteristics

n=80

Sr. No.	Personal Characteristics	Adopted Villages (40)		Non-Adopted Villages (40)	
		Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
1	Age group				
1	Young (up to 35 years)	8	20.00	9	22.50
2	Middle (36 to 50 years)	23	57.50	21	52.50
3	Old (50 years and above)	9	22.50	10	25.00
2	Level of Education				
1	Illiterate	5	12.50	8	20.00
2	Up to primary school level	29	72.50	26	65.00
3	Up to middle school level	5	12.50	5	12.50
4	Up to high school level	1	2.50	1	2.50
5	College and above	0	0.00	0	0.00
3	Social Participation				
1	Participated	25	62.50	11	27.50
2	Not participated	15	37.50	29	73.50
4	Extension Participation				
1	Not participated	0	0.00	8	20.00
2	Participated in one activity	0	0.00	13	32.50
3	Participated in more than one activity	40	100	19	47.50
5	Annual Income				
1	Above Rs. 2,00,000/-	0	0.00	0	0.00
2	Rs. 1,50,001 to 2,00,000	0	0.00	1	2.50
3	Rs. 1,00,001 to 1,50,000	0	0.00	3	0.00
4	Rs. 50,001 to 1,00,000	4	10.00	7	17.50
5	Up to Rs. 50,000	36	90.00	29	72.50
6	Occupation				
1	Farming	23	57.50	27	67.50
2	Animal Husbandry	0	0.00	0	0.00
3	Farming + Animal Husbandry	17	42.50	10	25.00
4	Service + Farming	0	0.00	2	5.00
5	Farming + Business	0	0.00	1	2.50
7	Land Holding				
1	> 10 ha	0	0.00	0	0.00
2	4.01 – 10.00 ha	0	0.00	2	5.00
3	2.01 – 4.00 ha	3	7.50	10	25.50
4	1.01 – 2.00 ha	10	25.00	9	22.50
5	0.01 – 1.00 ha	27	67.50	19	47.50
8	Economic motivation				
1	Low economic motivation (< 15 score)	4	10.00	10	25.00
2	Medium economic motivation (15-17 score)	28	70.00	22	55.00
3	High economic motivation (> 17 score)	8	20.00	8	20.00

Mean-16 S.D. -1

1.3 Social participation

The data in [Table-1(3)] revealed that about two-third majority (62.50 per cent) of the respondents were participated in social organizations and 37.50 per cent of the respondents were not participated in social activities in adopted villages while, majority (73.50 per cent) of the respondents were not participated in social organizations and 27.50 per cent of the respondents were participated in social organizations in non-adopted villages. These results were conformity with those reported by [3].

1.4 Extension participation

It was observed from the data presented in [Table-1(4)] that all (100.00 per cent) the respondents were participated in more than one activities in adopted villages while, about (47.50 per cent) of the respondents were participated in more than one activity followed by 20.00 per cent were not participated in any activity in non-adopted villages. These data were supported by the findings of [3] & [4].

1.5 Annual Income

It is apparent from [Table-1(5)] that majority (90.00 and 72.50 per cent) of the respondents had annual income up to Rs. 50,000/- in adopted and non-adopted villages, respectively followed by 10.00 per cent and 17.50 per cent of the respondents had annual income between Rs. 50,001 to 1,00,000 in adopted and non-adopted villages, respectively. Similar findings were reported by [1] & [4].

1.6 Occupation

The data presented in [Table-1(6)] revealed that majority (57.50 and 67.50 per

cent) of the respondents were engaged in farming as their main occupation in adopted and non-adopted villages, respectively followed by farming + Animal Husbandry 42.50 and 25.00 per cent of the respondents were engaged in adopted and non-adopted villages, respectively. The findings were in agreement with those reported by [6].

1.7 Land holding

The data presented in [Table-1(7)] shows that more than two-third (67.50 per cent) of the respondents possessed land up to 1.00 ha followed by 25.00 per cent of the respondents possessed 1.01 – 2.00 ha of land in adopted villages while, half (47.50 per cent) of the respondents possessed land up to 1.00 ha followed by (25.50 per cent) respondents possessed 2.01 – 4.00 ha in non-adopted villages. The findings were in agreement with those reported by [4,5] & [6].

1.8 Economic motivation

The data presented in [Table-1(8)] revealed that majority (70.00 and 55.00 per cent) of the respondents were found to have medium level of economic motivation in adopted and non-adopted villages, respectively while, 22.00 per cent and 25.00 per cent of the respondents had found high and low economic motivation in adopted and non-adopted villages, respectively. Similar findings were reported by [1] & [4].

Conclusion

From the results it can be concluded that majority of the respondents were in middle age group, educated up to primary school level, participated in social

activities, participated in more than one extension activity, annual income up to Rs.50,000/-, engaged in farming as main occupation, possessed 0.01 – 2.00 ha of land and found to have medium level of economic motivation in adopted villages. Whereas, majority of the respondents were in middle age group, educated up to primary school level, not participated in social activities, participated in more than one extension activity, annual income up to Rs. 50,000/-, engaged in farming as main occupation, possessed 0.01 – 1.00 ha of land and found to have medium level of economic motivation in non-adopted villages.

Application of research: Study played significant role in increasing the knowledge and adoption of recommended Pigeon Pea production technologies by the Pigeon Pea growers

Research Category: Extension Education

Abbreviations:

FLD: Front Line Demonstrations

Acknowledgement / Funding: Authors are thankful to Director of Extension Education, Navsari Agricultural University, Navsari, 396450, Gujarat

*** Principle Investigator / Research Guide: S. R. Kumbhani**

University: Navsari Agricultural University, Navsari, 396450, Gujarat

Research project name or number: Nil

Author Contributions: All author equally contributed

Author statement: All authors read, reviewed, agree and approved the final manuscript

Ethical approval: This article does not contain any studies with human participants or animals performed by any of the authors.

Conflict of Interest: None declared

References

- [1] Borole P.Y. (2010) Attitude of demonstrated paddy growers towards SRI technique of paddy crop. *M.Sc. (Agri.) thesis (Unpublished)*, Anand Agricultural University, Anand.
- [2] Dhaneshwar S. (2008) Impact of Krishi Vigyan Kendra, Devataj on the farmers of Anand district. *M.Sc. (Agri.) thesis (Unpublished)*, Anand Agricultural University, Anand.
- [3] Dholariya P.C. (2014) Impact of Frontline Demonstration on Paddy Cultivators of Navsari District of South Gujarat. *M.Sc. (Agri.) Thesis (Unpublished)*, NAU, Navsari.
- [4] Koli M.A. (2012) Knowledge and adoption of coconut production technology in Junagadh district of Gujarat state. *M.Sc. (Agri.) thesis (Unpublished)*, Junagadh Agricultural University, Junagadh.
- [5] Mohanty A.K., Lepch B.L. and Ashok Kumar (2013) *Indian Research Journal Extension Education*, 13(2), 51-56.
- [6] Rathod M.K., Tidke G.R. and Mandve R.P. (2012) *International Journal of Extension Education*, 7(1/2), 87-92.
- [7] Rathod M.K., Tidke G.R. and Mandve R.P. (2013) *International Journal of Extension Education*, 13(2), 72-77.