

STUDIES OF PERSONAL PROFILE AND ADOPTION LEVEL OF RSVY TRAINEES IN RELATION TO BIODYNAMIC PRACTICES IN TOMATO CROP IN BALIA DISTRICT

Dr. Manju Yadav

State Consultant

Department of Agriculture & Farmers Welfare

National Food Security Mission

Panchkula, Haryana

Email: manurao2005@gmail.com

Dr. Monika Yadav

Assistant Professor

Department of Home Science

OM Sterling Global University

Hisar, Haryana

Email: yadavmonika692@gmail.com

Abstract

The survey was conducted in Balia (U.P.) covering six blocks, six villages and sixty respondents with a view to ascertain the personal profile of respondents and the adoption level of the Biodynamic Package of Practices (B.P.P.) by trainees under the RSVY program implemented in the Department of Horticulture at K.A.P.G. College, Allahabad during 2017-18.

The Study inferred that majority of the respondents were in the middle age group, School level educated, and Middle-income group with High mass media exposure. The component of B.P.P. technology such as harvesting, seed sowing, land preparation and seed treatment was found to be adopted by the majority of the respondents. However, the components such as irrigation, fertilization and crop protection were poorly adopted by them and need intensive training in order to develop the skill among the participants.

Keywords

Adoption, RSVY, Trainees and Biodynamic Practices.

Reference to this paper
should be made as follows:

Received: 12.05.2022

Approved: 20.06.2022

Dr. Manju Yadav,

Dr. Monika Yadav,

*STUDENTS OF PERSONAL
PROFILE AND ADOPTION LEVEL
OF RSVY TRAINEES IN
RELATION TO BIODYNAMIC
PRACTICES IN TOMATO CROP IN
BALIA DISTRICT*

RJPSSs 2022, Vol. XLVIII,

No. 1, pp.31-37

Article No.4

Similarity Check: 25%

Online available at:

<http://rjpss.anubooks.com>

DOI: *<https://doi.org/10.31995/rjpss.2022v48i01.04>*

Introduction

Diversification of agriculture enterprises, innovations, Indigenous Technological Knowledge (ITKs), farm machinery and crucial inputs has become imperative in limited units of land for not only quality produce and profit optimization but also for employment, sustainability, eco-friendly and holistic development. To achieve such a pilot goal the policymakers, administrators, scientists and even farmers have realized for agriculture diversification. In his regard, training is a very potent tool to conceptualize and impart knowledge and transfer the skill to the trainees.

Indiscriminate use of chemicals caused alarming situations in the field of health, food, cloth and the biosphere. We have a rich wealth of I.T.Ks. for quality and yield improvement without any kind of deterioration. Rishi-Krishi, Homa-Farming, Biodynamic and Organic Farming are a few examples of such types of I.T.Ks.

Ascertaining Profiles is an important approach to drawing definite conclusions about the participants. Characters like, age, education, income, size of landholding, social participation, and mass media exposure are critical predictors influencing the skill development and technology adoption. Adoption of B.P.P. at the field level is a very complex phenomenon which governs by several obvious and hidden factors. Despite similar training package adoption variabilities are observed in field situations.

In view of the above facts, it was felt imperative to examine the adoption of a biodynamic package of practices in Tomato crops in farmer's fields.

Methodology

Balia District was selected purposively because of the potential vegetable growers available in that area. Investigation had covered all the six-block in the district with ten farmers from each block who were actively engaged in vegetable production.

For the selection of the respondent a list of progressive farmers from each block was prepared by the U.P. Government, Directorate of Horticulture of the District, after selection the list of trainees was sent to the RSVY, (Horticulture Unit), Lucknow from where they were ordered to undergo for training on Biodynamic Horticulture at K.A.P.G. College, Allahabad. A total of sixty farmers were trained on a specialized subject. For the analysis of personal profiles, the data were collected through the personal interview method. The data relating to the adoption of B. P.P. were collected with the help of an interview schedule. The collected data were analyzed with the use of simple statistical tools and conclusions were drawn.

Results and Discussion

Personal Profile of the Respondents :

Personal Profile included as Age, Education, Income, Land Holding Size, Social Participation and Mass Media Exposure in the study.

Table 1: Personal profile of B.P.P trainees

Age Composition in Years	Frequency	Percentage
(a) Yong (up to 30 years)	10	16.67
(b) Middle (above 30 years and up to 50 years)	45	75.00
(c) Old (above 50 years)	5	8.33
Total	60	100
Educational Qualification		
(a) Illiterate	3	5.00
(b) Primary to middle	10	16.67
(c) School level	37	61.67
(d) Graduate and above	10	16.67
Total	60	100
Annual Income in Rupees		
(a) Low (up to Rs. 30,000)	16	25
(b) Medium (more than Rs. 30,000 and up to Rs. 60,000)	30	50
(c) High (more than Rs. 60,000)	14	25
Total	60	100
Land Holding Size		
(a) Small (up to 1.0 ha)	30	50
(b) Medium (>1.0 to 2.0 ha)	19	31.67
(c) Large (> 2.0 ha)	11	18.33
Total	60	100
Social Participation		
(a) No membership	27	45.00
(b) Member of one organization	18	30.00
(c) Member of More than one organization	9	15.00
(d) office-bearer	6	1.00
Total	60	100
Mass Media Exposure		
(a) Low (up to 25)	20	33.33
(b) Medium (> 25 to 50)	23	38.33
(c) High (> 50)	17	28.33
Total	60	100

As revealed in the Table 1, the majority of the trainees (75.00%) were in the middle age group followed by young age (16.67%) and 8.33% old age.

From an education point of view 61.67% had school level, 16.67% each primary and graduate level and only 5.00% were found to be illiterate. The majority

of trainees were of medium-income (50%) group followed by 25% each of low and higher income group. Fifty percent were found to have a small landholding size followed by medium, (31.67%) and large (18.33%). Very poor social participation was observed and 45% were found to that any membership whereas 30% were having one organization membership and 15% with more than two organization membership but only 01.00% were found to be an office-bearer. In relation to mass media exposure, 38.33% were medium level followed by low 33.33% and 38.33% high. The findings are in the conformity with the findings of Patel & Thakkar (1991), Kokate (1980), Mishra (1994) and Rathour (2000).

Adoption of B.P.P.

It is evident from the Table-2 that the majority of the trainees (78.10%) who adopted the B.P.P. in Tomato crop were of the middle age group followed by the young (44.30%), and old age group (37.80%); an average of 69.28%, adopted one or more practices and rest (30%), were not found to be adopters of any B.D. practice in Tomato cultivation. In education, overwhelming majority of trainees 79.51% adopted is of school level, followed by graduation and above (57.10%), primary to the middle (54.20%) and only 33.33% illiterate. The adoption percentage of 83.80 was greater in the medium income group followed by the higher income group (71.43%) and least (31.25%) in the low-income group. Trainees with small landholding sizes have had higher adoption (75.23%), followed by medium (68.89%), and large (51.91%). The role of social participation in adoption was found to be ineffective and 78.81% of adopters had no social linkage while 73.81% of adopters were found to be office bearers and 61.11% were associated with one organization and 54.00% had linkage with more than one organization. Mass media exposure yielded greater adaptability and 70.59%, of adopters, were of high exposure to mass media followed by medium (69.57%) and 67.85% low.

These findings are supported by the findings of Choudhary et. al. (1988) Singh & Singh (1990), Reddy et. al. (1982) and Kokate (1980).

Conclusion

It can be concluded that RSVY training was found to be significantly effective in the adoption of B.D.P.P. in Tomato crops and the personal profiles of the participants too had affected the adoption of B.D.P.P. significantly.

References

1. Choudhary, S.D., Sharma, S.S., Gour, R.A. (1988). Adoption behavior of trained farmers. *Maharashtra Journal of Extension Education*. vol.VII. Pg. 197-199.

2. Kokate, K.D. (1980). A stud on training needs as perceived by the farmers of KVK villages (Karnal). Unpublished M.Sc, thesis, Kurukshetra University, NDRI: Karnal (Haryana).
3. Mishra, M.K. (1994). Impact of training program of KVK-R.K. Mission divayan in the tribal area of Ranchi district, Bihar. Unpublished M.Sc. Thesis, NDRI: Karnal (Haryana)
4. Patel, G.J., Thakkar, K.A. (1991). Training needs of trained and untrained rural women in relation to animal husbandry practices. Paper presented in seminar on “*Training for rural Journal of Natural Resource and Development development: prospects and Retrospects*” held at Directorate & Extension Education. Kokan Krishi Vidyapeeth: Dapoi. Nov. 22-23. Pg. **111**.
5. Rathore, Rajendra. (2000). A study on information needs and utilization patterns of the farm publications. Published by the Rajasthan Agricultural University, Ph. D Thesis, GBPUA & T., Pantnagar.
6. Reddy, M.V., Reddy, B.L., Rao, V.M., Murthy, C.R. (1982). Relationship between farmer’s background and knowledge acquired through farmers training program – An experimental evidence. *Andhra Agricultural Journal. vol.29(1)*. Pg. **75-77**.
7. Singh, M., Singh, M.P. (1990). Training affecting symbolic adoption: A multivariate approach. *Indian Journal of Extension Education. vol.XXVI (1&2)* Pg. **61-66**.

Table 2: Adoption of B.P.P.

Personal Profile	Land Preparation		Seed Treatment		Seed Sowing		Fertilization		Irrigation		Crop protection		Harvesting		Total Mean	
	Fr., %	Fr., %	Fr., %	Fr., %	Fr., %	Fr., %	Fr., %	Fr., %	Fr., %	Fr., %	Fr., %	Fr., %	Fr., %	Fr., %	Fr., %	Fr., %
Age Composition in Years																
(a) Young (up to 30 years)	7 (70.00)	6 (60.00)	4 (40.00)	4 (40.00)	3 (30.00)	3 (30.00)	4 (40.00)	4 (40.00)	3 (30.00)	2 (20.00)	2 (20.00)	5 (50.00)	5 (50.00)	44 (97.78)	4.43 (44.30)	35.14 (78.10)
(b) Middle (above 30 years and up to 50 years)	39 (86.67)	35 (77.78)	43 (95.55)	27 (60.00)	27 (60.00)	27 (60.00)	33 (73.33)	33 (73.33)	25 (55.55)	25 (55.55)	25 (55.55)	44 (97.78)	44 (97.78)	44 (97.78)	35.14 (78.10)	35.14 (78.10)
(c) Old (above 50 years)	2 (40.00)	2 (40.00)	3 (60.00)	1 (20.00)	1 (20.00)	1 (20.00)	1 (20.00)	1 (20.00)	1 (20.00)	1 (20.00)	1 (20.00)	3 (60.00)	3 (60.00)	3 (60.00)	1.89 (37.80)	1.89 (37.80)
Total	48 (80.00)	44 (73.33)	50 (83.33)	31 (50.10)	31 (50.10)	31 (50.10)	38 (63.33)	38 (63.33)	28 (46.00)	28 (46.00)	28 (46.00)	52 (86.67)	52 (86.67)	52 (86.67)	41.57 (69.29)	41.57 (69.29)
Educational Qualification																
(a) Illiterate	2 (66.67)	1 (33.33)	2 (66.67)	0 (00.00)	0 (00.00)	0 (00.00)	0 (00.00)	0 (00.00)	0 (00.00)	0 (00.00)	0 (00.00)	2 (66.67)	2 (66.67)	2 (66.67)	1 (33.33)	1 (33.33)
(b) Primary to middle	8 (80.00)	5 (50.00)	7 (70.00)	3 (30.00)	3 (30.00)	3 (30.00)	4 (40.00)	4 (40.00)	3 (30.00)	3 (30.00)	3 (30.00)	8 (80.00)	8 (80.00)	8 (80.00)	5.42 (54.20)	5.42 (54.20)
(c) School level	31 (83.78)	38 (83.78)	34 (91.89)	25 (67.57)	25 (67.57)	25 (67.57)	28 (75.68)	28 (75.68)	22 (59.46)	22 (59.46)	22 (59.46)	35 (94.59)	35 (94.59)	35 (94.59)	29.42 (79.51)	29.42 (79.51)
(d) Graduate and above	7 (70.00)	7 (70.00)	7 (70.00)	3 (30.00)	3 (30.00)	3 (30.00)	6 (60.00)	6 (60.00)	3 (30.00)	3 (30.00)	3 (30.00)	7 (70.00)	7 (70.00)	7 (70.00)	5.71 (57.10)	5.71 (57.10)
Total	48 (80.00)	44 (73.33)	50 (83.33)	31 (50.10)	31 (50.10)	31 (50.10)	38 (63.33)	38 (63.33)	28 (46.00)	28 (46.00)	28 (46.00)	52 (86.67)	52 (86.67)	52 (86.67)	41.57 (69.29)	41.57 (69.29)
Annual Income in Rs.																
(a) Low (up to Rs. 30,000)	8 (50.00)	6 (37.50)	10 (62.50)	3 (18.75)	3 (18.75)	3 (18.75)	4 (25.00)	4 (25.00)	2 (12.00)	2 (12.00)	2 (12.00)	12 (75.00)	12 (75.00)	12 (75.00)	5 (31.25)	5 (31.25)
(b) Medium (more than Rs. 30,000 and up to Rs. 60,000)	28 (93.33)	26 (86.67)	30 (100)	21 (70.00)	21 (70.00)	21 (70.00)	22 (73.33)	22 (73.33)	21 (70.00)	21 (70.00)	21 (70.00)	28 (93.33)	28 (93.33)	28 (93.33)	25.14 (83.80)	25.14 (83.80)
(c) High (more than 60,000)	12 (85.71)	12 (85.71)	10 (71.43)	7 (50.00)	7 (50.00)	7 (50.00)	12 (85.71)	12 (85.71)	5 (35.71)	5 (35.71)	5 (35.71)	12 (85.71)	12 (85.71)	12 (85.71)	10 (71.43)	10 (71.43)
Total	48 (80.00)	44 (73.33)	50 (83.33)	31 (50.10)	31 (50.10)	31 (50.10)	38 (63.33)	38 (63.33)	28 (46.00)	28 (46.00)	28 (46.00)	52 (86.67)	52 (86.67)	52 (86.67)	41.57 (69.29)	41.57 (69.29)
Land Holding Size in ha																
(a) Small (up to 1.0 ha)	27 (90.00)	24 (80.00)	28 (93.33)	17 (56.67)	17 (56.67)	17 (56.67)	20 (66.67)	20 (66.67)	14 (46.67)	14 (46.67)	14 (46.67)	28 (93.33)	28 (93.33)	28 (93.33)	25.57 (75.23)	25.57 (75.23)
(b) Medium (>1.0 to 2.0 ha)	15 (78.95)	14 (73.68)	16 (84.21)	9 (47.37)	9 (47.37)	9 (47.37)	13 (68.42)	13 (68.42)	10 (52.63)	10 (52.63)	10 (52.63)	16 (84.21)	16 (84.21)	16 (84.21)	13.28 (68.89)	13.28 (68.89)
(c) Large (> 2.0 ha)	6 (54.55)	6 (54.55)	6 (54.55)	5 (45.45)	5 (45.45)	5 (45.45)	5 (45.45)	5 (45.45)	4 (36.36)	4 (36.36)	4 (36.36)	8 (84.2)	8 (84.2)	8 (84.2)	5.71 (51.91)	5.71 (51.91)
Total	48 (80.00)	44 (73.33)	50 (83.33)	31 (50.10)	31 (50.10)	31 (50.10)	38 (63.33)	38 (63.33)	28 (46.00)	28 (46.00)	28 (46.00)	52 (86.67)	52 (86.67)	52 (86.67)	41.57 (69.29)	41.57 (69.29)
Social Participation																
(a) No membership	23 (85.19)	23 (85.19)	24 (88.89)	19 (70.37)	19 (70.37)	19 (70.37)	20 (74.07)	20 (74.07)	16 (59.26)	16 (59.26)	16 (59.26)	24 (88.89)	24 (88.89)	24 (88.89)	21.28 (78.81)	21.28 (78.81)
(b) Up to one organization	12 (66.67)	11 (61.11)	40 (77.78)	7 (38.89)	7 (38.89)	7 (38.89)	10 (55.56)	10 (55.56)	8 (44.44)	8 (44.44)	8 (44.44)	50 (83.33)	50 (83.33)	50 (83.33)	11.00 (61.11)	11.00 (61.11)
(c) Member of more than one organization	6 (66.67)	5 (55.56)	7 (77.78)	3 (33.33)	3 (33.33)	3 (33.33)	4 (44.44)	4 (44.44)	2 (22.22)	2 (22.22)	2 (22.22)	7 (77.78)	7 (77.78)	7 (77.78)	4.86 (54.00)	4.86 (54.00)
(d) office bearer	6 (100.00)	5 (83.33)	5 (83.33)	3 (50.00)	3 (50.00)	3 (50.00)	4 (66.67)	4 (66.67)	2 (33.33)	2 (33.33)	2 (33.33)	6 (100.00)	6 (100.00)	6 (100.00)	4.43 (73.81)	4.43 (73.81)
Total	48 (80.00)	44 (73.33)	50 (83.33)	31 (50.10)	31 (50.10)	31 (50.10)	38 (63.33)	38 (63.33)	28 (46.00)	28 (46.00)	28 (46.00)	52 (86.67)	52 (86.67)	52 (86.67)	41.57 (69.29)	41.57 (69.29)

Mass Media Exposure										
(a) Low (up to 25)	17 (85.00)	15 (75.00)	16 (80.00)	9 (45.00)	12 (60.00)	9 (45.00)	17 (85.00)	13.57 (67.89)		
(b) Medium (> 25 to 50)	19 (82.61)	18 (78.26)	19 (82.61)	12 (52.17)	13 (56.52)	11 (47.83)	20 (86.96)	16.00 (69.57)		
(c) High (> 50)	12 (70.59)	11 (64.71)	15 (88.24)	10 (58.82)	13 (66.47)	8 (47.06)	15 (88.24)	12.0 (70.59)		
Total	48 (80.00)	44 (73.33)	50 (83.33)	31 (50.10)	38 (63.33)	28 (46.00)	52 (86.67)	41.57 (69.29)		