

*Full Length Research Paper*

# **Attitude of redgram farmers towards front line demonstrations**

**Narayana Swamy C<sup>1\*</sup>, Gopala Y.M<sup>2</sup> and Bharat Kumar T.P<sup>2</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Department of Agricultural Extension, University of Agricultural Sciences, Bangalore -560065

<sup>2</sup>Ph.D Scholars, Department of Agricultural Extension, University of Agricultural Sciences, Bangalore -560065

Accepted 21 September, 2013

**The study was conducted in two villages of Ramanagara district in Karnataka state to measure the attitude of demonstration and other farmers towards Front Line Demonstrations (FLDs). Sixty FLD/demonstration farmers and forty other farmers were interviewed using a pre-tested schedule. The data were collected through personal interview with the help of pre-tested schedule. The collected data were processed, tabulated, classified and analysed in terms of mean percent scores, ranks, etc. in the light of objectives of the study. There existed a significant difference in the attitudinal levels towards FLD between FLD farmers and non- FLD farmers. Almost all the other farmers sought information from demonstration/ FLD farmers regarding improved practices in Redgram cultivation.**

**Keywords:** Attitude, Front Line Demonstration, Source of Consultancy.

## **INTRODUCTION**

One of the important mandates of Indian Council of Agriculture Research (ICAR) is to organize Front Line Demonstrations (FLDs) through State Agricultural Universities (SAU's), ICAR institutes and selected reputed voluntary organizations on various crops to generate production data and feedback information to prove the production potentialities of the newly developed crop production technologies and also to study the factors contributing to higher production.

The main objective of Front-Line Demonstrations is to demonstrate newly released crop production and protection technologies and its management practices in the farmers' field under different agro-climatic regions and farming situations. While demonstrating the technologies in the farmers' field, the scientists are required to study the factors contributing higher crop production, field constraints of production and thereby generate production data and feedback information. Frontline Demonstrations are conducted in a block of two

or four hectares land in order to have better impact of the demonstrated technologies on the farmers and field level extension functionaries.

The improved technology packages were also found to be financially attractive. Yet, adoption levels for several components of the improved technology were low, emphasizing the need for better dissemination (Kiresur et al, 2001). Several biotic, abiotic and socio-economic constraints inhibit exploitation of the yield potential and these needs to be addressed. The state-wise yields obtained both under improved technology and farmers' practice ranges from 12 to 110% between states and the national average being 36%. The additional production that can be attained by exploiting the yield gap at national level is about 2 million tones (Kumar and Chauhan, 2005).

The crops in the FLDs include major cereals, oilseeds and pulses. The technologies in the FLDs are demonstrated for the first time before being fed into the main extension system of State Department of Agriculture. The FLDs are normally conducted at farmers and the demonstration plots of state agricultural universities, Indian Council of Agriculture Research

\*Corresponding authors: Email: [cnswamyextn@gmail.com](mailto:cnswamyextn@gmail.com)

**Table1:** Differential attitude of Demonstration farmers and other farmers towards Front Line Demonstrations

Sl.no	Farmers category	Mean attitude score	Mean difference	't' value
1	Demonstration farmers	10.65		
2	Other farmers	8.30	2.35	6.634*

\* Significant at 1% level

institutes etc. It is very necessary to know how far the FLDs have influenced the attitude of demonstration farmers and other farmers. Hence, the present study is undertaken with the following specific objectives.

- To measure the attitude of demonstration farmers and other farmers towards Front Line Demonstrations.
- To know the influence of Front Line Demonstrations on other farmers as a source of information.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study was carried out Magadi Taluk of Ramanagara District in Karnataka State. Sixty nine FLDs were carried out by Extension Education Unit, University of Agricultural Sciences, Bangalore in Kalya and Basavanapalya villages in Magadi taluk. Sixty FLD farmers (demonstration farmers) and another 40 redgram farmers were randomly selected for the study. Ex-post fact research design was followed in the study. The respondents were interviewed with a pre-tested schedule. Attitude of redgram farmers was measured using 14 statements. Of which seven were positive and the other seven were negative statements. Each statement was measured on a two point continuum namely 'agree' and 'disagree' assigning scores of 1 and 0, respectively.

The minimum and maximum score one could get was 0 and 14, respectively. After obtaining the total attitude mean scores of respondents. The 't' test was applied to find out whether there is difference in attitude between demonstration farmers and other farmers. The collected data were analyzed using frequency, per centage, mean and 't' test.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Attitude of redgram farmers towards front line demonstrations

- Differential attitude of Demonstration farmers and other farmers towards Front Line Demonstrations Table 1 shows that the mean attitude score of demonstration farmers was 10.65, whereas the mean attitude score of other farmers was 8.30. The difference between the value was found to

be significant at 1 per cent level. It indicates that, there is clear significant difference in the attitude between demonstration farmers and other farmers towards Front Line Demonstration.

- Distribution of Respondents on Attitude towards Front Line Demonstration by Demonstration Farmers and Other Farmers Item- wise analysis of attitude statements is presented in the table 2, statement (1) which is positive statement 95 per cent of demonstrations farmers favoured (agreed) the statement. In statement (3) which is negative statement, 82 per cent of demonstration farmers and 48 per cent of other farmers disagreed. Statement (5) which is negative statement, 50 per cent of other farmers disagreed. In statement (9) which is positive statement 88 per cent of demonstration farmers and 60 per cent of other farmers agreed. Statement (10) which is negative statement about 35 per cent of other farmers disagreed. In case of statement (11) which is positive statement, 92 per cent of demonstration farmers and majority of (60%) other farmers favoured. Statement (14) which is a negative statement 63 per cent of demonstration farmers and 35 per cent of other farmers disagreed and further results are furnished in the Table-2.

The demonstration farmers had higher attitude scores, when compared to the other farmers (Table 1). The differential attitude was further evident from the Table 2, in which majority of demonstration farmers favored Front Line Demonstrations, further it is interesting to note that, quite a good number of other farmers also had positive attitude towards Front Line Demonstrations. This could be due to the indirect effect on the other farmers from Front Line Demonstrations conducted and gain in knowledge about improved Redgram cultivation practices. It is further confirmed from the information source consultancy pattern of other farmers.

The demonstration farmers had positive attitude towards Front Line Demonstrations, the possible reasons for this could be that the demonstration farmers had frequent interaction with the scientists of Front Line Demonstrations, who effectively convinced demonstration farmers about superiority of scientific agriculture, as well as benefits they could derive from Front Line Demonstrations programme. This has enabled the demonstration farmers to have positive attitude

**Table2:** Distribution of Respondents on Attitude towards Front Line Demonstration by Demonstration Farmers and Other Farmers

Sl.No	Attitude Statements	Demonstration farmers (n=60)				Other farmers (n=40)			
		Agree		Disagree		Agree		Disagree	
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
1	Front Line demonstration is the best method of demonstration convincingly to the farmers the production potentialities per unit area of land	57	95.00	3	5.00	23	58.00	17	42.00
2	Front Line demonstration is the mere waste of money, time and effort	5	8.00	55	92.00	16	40.00	24	60
3	Scientist cannot solve the specific problems of the farming community	11	18.00	49	82.00	21	52.00	19	48.00
4	Each demonstrator is better educated regarding the technology through Frontline demonstration	49	82.00	11	18.00	15	37.00	25	63.00
5	It is waste of time to scientist to meet the farmers	8	13.00	52	87.00	20	50.00	20	50.00
6	Front Line demonstration is a boon to the farmers as it makes the provision for direct guidance and advise from the research scientist/extension workers	50	83.00	10	17.00	18	45.00	22	55.00
7	The scientists are very particular in insisting on their own findings to be adopted	4	7.00	56	93.00	23	58.00	17	42.00
8	Pulse crops helps in efficient utilization of the applied fertilizers and enriches soils	45	75.00	15	25.00	19	47.00	21	53.00
9	The purpose of the Front Line demonstration is to prove the production potentialities of the newly developed crop production technologies and also to study factors contributing for higher production	53	88.00	7	12.00	24	60.00	16	40.00
10	The improved technology is not feasible for farmers	14	23.00	46	77.00	26	65.00	14	35.00
11	Front Line demonstration serves as best class room situation for teaching farmers	54	92.00	6	8.00	24	60.00	16	40.00
12	Front Line demonstration is no way better than the demonstration conducted by extension worker	5	8.00	55	92.00	22	55.00	18	45.00
13	Front Line demonstration helps to train field level extension functionaries and farmers through its extension education activities and assisting them with scientific management of crops through cost benefit analysis	51	85.00	9	15.00	23	58.00	7	42.00
14	Front Line demonstration will not provide any communication support through mass media or print media to the beneficiaries	22	37.00	38	63.00	26	65.00	14	35.00

towards Front Line Demonstrations. The findings of this study are in agreement with the findings of Subramanian (1992)

B. Information source consultancy pattern of other farmers regarding specific recommended practices of Redgram.

In the Table 3, it is clearly evident that almost all the other farmers sought information from demonstration farmers regarding improved practices of Redgram cultivation. Out of 10 improved practices of Redgram cultivation, for

six practices other farmers quoted first rank for demonstration farmer for being information source consulted. Regarding practices like variety, seed treatment and post harvest technology, other farmers quoted Agricultural Assistant, as source of information consulted. For Integrated Pest Management (IPM) practices other farmers consulted extension guide as source of information.

Majority of other farmers consulted, demonstration farmers regarding Redgram

improved practices like seed rate, spacing, FYM application, fertilizers application, intercultural operations and plant protection measures. The possible reason for consulting demonstration farmers could be their enhanced credibility and availability to render advice and guidance in time to other Redgram cultivators in the study area.

Other farmers consulted Agricultural assistant regarding improved practices like variety, seed treatment with rhizobium culture and post

**Table 3:** Information Consultancy Pattern of other Farmers Regarding Specific Recommended Practices of Redgram

Practices	Front Line Demonstration			Agricultural Assistants			Extension Guide			Progressive Farmer			Neighbors			Seed Dealers			Fertilizer Dealers		
	N	%	R	N	%	R	N	%	R	N	%	R	N	%	R	N	%	R	N	%	R
1. Variety	6	15.00	II	23	58.00	I	6	15.00	I	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	13	I	-	-	-
2. Seed rate	9	23.00	I	5	13.00	II	1	3.00	I	-	-	-	1	3.00	I	4	10.00	I	-	-	-
3. Spacing	11	28.00	I	5	13.00	IV	1	3.00	V	6	15.00	II	3	8.00	I	-	-	-	-	-	-
4. Seed treatment (with rhizobium culture)	12	30.00	II	17	40.00	I	2	5.00	I	1	3.00	I	-	-	-	1	3.00	I	-	-	-
5. FYM application	12	30.00	I	3	8.00	III	1	3.00	V	6	15.00	II	2	5.00	I	-	-	-	-	-	-
6. Fertilizers	13	33.00	I	-	-	-	2	5.00	I	2	5.00	II	2	5.00	I	-	-	-	4	10.00	I
7. Inter-cultural operations	15	38.00	I	3	8.00	III	1	3.00	I	7	18.00	II	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
8. Plant protection measures	14	35.00	I	7	18.00	II	4	10.00	I	-	-	-	2	5.00	I	-	-	-	4	10.00	I
9. IPM	2	5.00	II	2	5.00	II	9	23.00	I	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10. Post harvest technology	4	10.00	II	10	25.00	I	3	8.00	I	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

N=Number, R=Rank

harvest technology practices convincingly to the farmers in the local language and after establishing the front line demonstrations, extension guide was not available for consultancy. Therefore the next locally available Agricultural Assistant was consulted for these practices.

For IPM practice, majority of other farmers consulted extension guide, because the IPM is a new concept and extension guide's familiarity with IPM practices like installation of pheromone traps, light traps and use of NPV, neem oil spraying etc., The present findings are in partial conformity with the findings of Desai (1975) and Sheshachar (2007).

## CONCLUSION

The attitude towards front line demonstrations by participant and non-participant farmers has favoured the opinion towards concept of FLDs. The study revealed that mean attitude score of demonstration farmers was 10.65, whereas the mean attitude score of other farmers was 8.30. The difference between the value was found to be significant at 1 per cent level. Therefore the

implementing officers should make an effort to utilize the FLDs as an educational tool for the adoption of recommended practices of Redgram to increase the productivity of the crop. The implementing officers must also create wider awareness and involvement of other fellow farmers in the extension activities such as field days, field visits and training programmes around these demonstrations.

## REFERENCES

- Desai GR (1975). Adoption of recommended potato cultivation practices. M.Sc (Agri).Thesis(unpub.), Univ. Agril. Sci., Bangalore.
- Kiresur VR, Ramanna Rao SV, Hedge DM (2001). Improved technologies in oilseeds production-An assessment of their economic potentials in India. Agricultural Economic Research Review 14 (2):95-108.
- Kumar, Arvind, Chauhan JS (2005). Status and future thrust areas of rapeseed-mustard research in India. Indian Journal of Agricultural Sciences. 75 (10):621-635.
- Sheshachar K (2007). Adoption behavior of chilly growers. M.Sc (Agri).Thesis (unpub.), Univ. Agril. Sci., Bangalore.
- Subramaniam KP (1992). A critical analysis of National Demonstration in Sunflower. M.Sc (Agri).Thesis (unpub.), Univ. Agril. Sci., Bangalore.