

Profile of Gram Growers of Farmer Field School in Parbhani District

Biradar V.V, Khadge M.I. and Lade A.H.

¹ Department of Agril. Extension Education, COA, VNMKV, Parbhani

² Assistant Professor, Department of Agril. Extension Education, COA, VNMKV, Parbhani

³ Ph. D. Scholar, Department of Agril. Extension Education, COA, VNMKV, Parbhani
corresponding Author- ashishlade24@gmail.com

Submitted: 12-01-2023

Accepted: 25-01-2023

ABSTRACT

The present study was conducted in Parbhani district of Marathwada region of Maharashtra state. The study “**profile of gram growers of Farmer Field School in Parbhani District**” was conducted in Parbhani, Manvat and Selu talukas of Parbhani district, from each taluka four villages selected and from each village ten respondents were selected, total tune of 120 respondents were randomly selected for study. Ex-post-facto research design was used for the research study. It was noticed that, more than half of the respondents i.e. 62.50 per cent were in middle age group, more than twenty five per cent (28.33%) respondents were educated up to high school level, nearly two third (65.00%) of the respondents had medium size family, more than thirty per cent (33.34%) of the respondents had small size land holding, more than two third (68.34%) of the respondents had medium farming experience, more than sixty five per cent (69.16%) of the respondents had medium annual income i.e. Rs. 96,000 to Rs. 3,20,000, more than sixty per cent (62.50%) of the respondents had medium social participation, more than two fifth (44.17%) of respondents had medium scientific orientation and nearly two fourth (72.50%) of the respondents had medium level of knowledge.

Key words: Farmer Field School (FFS), gram grower, VNMKV, Marathwada

I. INTRODUCTION

An FAO manual describes a FFS as a school without walls where farmers learn in groups by trying out new ideas in their own fields, where this process empowers farmers to develop their own solutions to their own problems. FFSs aim to provide training in agricultural techniques and develop skills to empower farmers. Farmers' Field School has spread rapidly to all over India since their first introduction 1989 in Indonesia. Maharashtra is one of the state in India where

farmers' field school is running for development of management practices of crop production.

Pulses production and consumption are important in maintaining food security. Pulses occupy an important place in human diet. Pulses contain more protein than any other grains and vegetables. Cultivation of pulses helps to maintain soil fertility through the nitrogen fixation. India is the world's largest producer of pulses with 27 to 28 per cent share in worldwide production and 35.00 per cent of the global area. Chickpea, pigeonpea, mungbean, lentil, and field pea are important pulses crop contribute about respectively 39 per cent, 21 per cent, 11 per cent, 10 per cent, 7 per cent and 5 per cent of the total nation production of pulses. The total pulse production was estimated 168.45 Lakh tonne and an area of 153.53 Lakh ha with average productivity 1097 kg/ha in 2020-21. In India, total gram cultivation area under rabi crop was 96.96 Lakh ha and production was 119.11 Lakh tonne with average productivity 1192 kg/ha. In Maharashtra, cultivated area was 22.31 Lakh ha and production 23.96 Lakh tonne with average productivity 1074 kg/ha (DES, GoI, Min of Agri. & FW, 2021). In Parbhani district during year 2021-22, the area under gram cultivation was 1360.59 (“00” ha) and production 1697.68 (“00” tonne) with average productivity 1247.75 kg/ha.

Specific objective of the study :

-To study Profile of gram growers of Farmer Field School in Parbhani District

II. MATERIALS AND METHODS :

The research study was carried out in Parbhani district of Marathwada region of Maharashtra state. Parbhani, Manvat and Selu talukas were purposively selected because these three talukas found to represent the farmers' field school by department of agricultural in Parbhani district. From each taluka four villages selected and from each village ten respondents were selected,

total tune of 120 respondents were randomly selected for study. Ex-post-facto research design of social research was used for present study. The data

analysis was done using appropriate statistical test i.e. Percentage, Frequency, Mean, Standard Deviation.

III. RESULT AND DISCUSSION :

Table 1. Profile of gram growers of farmer field school

Sr. No.	Category	Respondents (n= 120)	
		Numbers	Percentage
Age (years)			
1	Young (Upto 32 years)	22	18.34
2	Middle (33 to 56 years)	75	62.50
3	Old (Above 56 years)	23	19.16
	Total	120	100.00
Education (std)			
1	Illiterate	04	03.34
2	Can read only	09	07.50
3	Can read and write	11	09.16
4	Primary (1 st -5 th std.)	15	12.50
5	Middle (6 th -9 th std.)	22	18.34
6	High School (10 th -12 th std.)	34	28.33
7	Graduate (above 12 th std.)	25	20.83
	Total	120	100.00
Family size			
1	Small (up to 3 members)	24	20.00
2	Medium (4 to 7 members)	78	65.00
3	Large (above 8 members)	18	15.00
	Total	120	100.00
Land holding (ha)			
1	Marginal (0.01 to 1.00 ha)	26	21.67
2	Small (1.01 to 2.00 ha)	40	33.34
3	Semi-Medium (2.01 to 4.00 ha)	34	28.33
4	Medium (4.01 to 10.00 ha)	14	11.66
5	Large (Above 10.00 ha)	06	05.00
	Total	120	100.00
Farming experience (year)			
1	Low	21	17.50
2	Medium	82	68.34
3	High	17	14.16
	Total	120	100.00
Annual income (Rs.)			
1	Low (Up to Rs. 95489)	19	15.84
2	Medium (Rs. 95490 to Rs.320,000)	83	69.16
3	High (above Rs.3,20,000)	18	15.00
	Total	120	100.00
Social participation			
1	Low (up to 5)	23	19.16
2	Medium (6 to 10)	75	62.50
3	High (above 10)	22	18.34
	Total	120	100.00
Scientific orientation			

1	Low (up to 18)	27	22.50
2	Medium (19 to 22)	53	44.17
3	High (above 22)	40	33.33
	Total	120	100.00
Knowledge			
1	Low (up to 14)	12	10.00
2	Medium (15 to 18)	87	72.50
3	High (above 18)	21	17.50
	Total	120	100.00

Age

The age of gram growers was considered as chronological age of the respondents in completed years at the time of interview. It was observed from Table 1 that, more than sixty per cent (62.50%) of gram growers were found in middle age group followed by old age group (19.16%) and young age group (18.34%) respectively. This finding is consistent with the finding of Parmar (2014).

Education

Education was considered as the number of year of formal education acquired by the gram growers which may be affected the adoption of improved technology. It was observed from Table 1 that, more than twenty five per cent (28.33%) of gram growers had high school education level followed by 20.83 per cent graduation education, 18.34 per cent middle education, 12.50 per cent primary education, 9.16 per cent can read and write, 7.50 per cent can read only and 3.33 per cent illiterate, respectively. This finding is in consonance with the observations of Maida (2015).

Family size

Family size refers to the number of members in the family living together under the one roof and having common mode of living. It was observed from Table 1 that, nearly two third (65.00%) of gram growers had medium family size group followed by small family size group (20.00%) and large family size group (15.00%), respectively. This finding is in consonance with the observations of Parmar (2014),

Land holding

It refers to number of hectares of land used for cultivation by the respondents at the time of interview was considered. It was observed from Table 1 that, more than thirty per cent (33.34 %) of gram growers had small (1.01 ha to 2.00 ha) land holding. followed by 28.33 per cent semi-medium land holding, 21.67 per cent marginal land

holding, 11.66 per cent medium land holding and five per cent large land holding respectively. This finding is in line with the finding of Laxminarayana and Shamkarnarayanan (2011).

Farming experience

Farming experience is operationally defined as the number of years of experience in the farming as an occupation at the time of investigation. It was observed from Table 1 that more than two third (68.34%) of gram growers had medium experience, followed by 17.50 per cent low experience and 14.16 per cent high experience respectively. The findings of the present study are in line with the findings of Kushwah (2016).

Annual income

It is refers as the total earnings of respondent's family from all sources of income in the year. It was observed from Table 1 that, nearly sixty per cent (69.16 %) of gram growers had medium annual income i.e. 96,000 to 3,20,000 rupees, followed by 15.84 per cent gram growers had annual income up to 96,000 rupees. fifteen per cent (15.00%) of gram growers had annual income above 3,20,000 rupees. The current study's findings are consistent with Tayade's findings (2010).

Social participation

It is operationally defined as a participation and involvement of respondent in various formal and informal organizations. It was observed from Table 1 that, more than sixty per cent (62.50%) of gram growers had medium level of social participation followed by low level social participation (19.16%) and high level social participation (18.34%). The current study's findings are consistent with Raghuvanshi's findings (2014).

Scientific orientation

The scientific orientation is operationally defined as the degree to which a respondent is oriented to use scientific methods in farming and decision making. It was observed from Table 1 that, more than two fifth (44.17%) of gram growers

had medium level of scientific orientation, followed by 33.33 per cent and 22.50 per cent of gram growers had high and low level of scientific orientation. This conclusion is similar with those of Makashre (2014).

Knowledge

It is operationally defined as awareness and understood information imparted through the training about Farmer Field School practices of Gram It was observed from Table 1 that, more than seventy per cent (72.50%) of gram growers were having medium knowledge level followed by 17.50 per cent and 10.00 per cent of them were in high and low knowledge level respectively. This outcome is consistent with the findings of Maida (2015) and Makashre (2014)

IV. CONCLUSION:

Majority of gram growers were found in middle age group, high education, medium family size group, small size land holding, medium farming experience, medium annual income from range 96,000 to 3,20,000 rupees, medium social participation, medium scientific orientation and medium knowledge level, respectively.

REFERENCES:

- [1]. DES, GoI, Min of Agri. & FW (2021). Crop wise area, production and productivity of pulses from 2010-11 to 2020-21, DPD, GoI, Bhopal.
- [2]. Kushwah (2016). A study on Impact of Farmer Field School on Knowledge and Adoption level of Wheat growers in Ujjain

- [3]. Laxminarayana and Shankarnarayana (2011). Impact of FFS on knowledge gain by Brinjal growers regarding IPM practices. Mysore J. Agri. SCI. 46(3):669-670.
- [4]. Maida, Mahesh Kumar (2015). A study on knowledge and attitude of small and marginal farmers towards high yielding varieties of chickpea in Piploda block of Ratlam district in Madhya Pradesh. M.sc (Agri.). Thesis submitted to the Rajmata Vijayraje Scindia Krishi Vishwa Vidhyalaya, Gwalior.
- [5]. Makashre (2014). A study on Knowledge and Adoption of Soybean Production Technology by the Farmers of Tikamgarh District, Madhya Pradesh.
- [6]. Parmar Lokendra (2014). An evaluation study of FFS on soybean management practices conducted by Agril. Department of Tikamagarh district of Madhya Pradesh, M.sc (Agri.). Thesis submitted to the RVSKVV, Gwalior.
- [7]. Raghuwanshi Rajkumari (2014). A Study on training needs of potato growers in Gwalior districts of Madhya Pradesh, M.sc (Agri.) Thesis submitted to RVSKVV, Gwalior.
- [8]. Tayade R.V. (2010). Technological gap in cotton cultivation technology, M.sc (Agri.) Thesis submitted to MPKV, Rahuri.