

Impact of Front-Line Demonstration on knowledge of mustard producers in CD block Nandgaon of Mathura district of Uttar Pradesh

¹Jagdish Singh, ²Dr.Syed H. Mazhar, ³Dr. (Ms) Jahanara,

¹(Ag.) Extension Student, ²Associate Professor, ³Professor and Head

Department of Agricultural Extension and Communication SHUATS Allahabad, (U.P)

Email – ¹jagdishraghav02@gmail.com, ²syedhmazhar@gmail.com, ³jajahanr648@gmail.com,

Abstract: Mustard has been a traditionally important oilseed crop in the India. It is a major Rabi crop. Cultivation of mustard is between October-November and February-March. The study was conducted in the cd block Nandgaon districts of Mathura Five villages where FLDs conducted by Mathura KVK as treated villages and five villages where no such demonstrations conducted by Mathura KVK as control villages were selected from purposively selected Nandgaon block of Mathura district for the purpose of this study. Two types of respondents were selected from these villages: (i) FLD beneficiary farmers and (ii) non-beneficiary farmers. From each group, 55 farmers were randomly selected. The total sample, therefore, consisted 110 respondents' farmers in both the group for collection of data. The data was collected through a well-structured and pre-tested interview schedule. Majority of the beneficiary respondents were found to have high level of knowledge while non-beneficiaries were found low level of knowledge of improved production practices of Mustard.

Keywords: Knowledge, FLD, Mustard producers.

1. INTRODUCTION:

Mustard [*Brassica juncea* L.) is predominantly cultivated in Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh, Haryana, Madhya Pradesh and Gujarat. Uttar Pradesh accounts for 10.85% and 11.19% of area and production, respectively in the country with the average yield of 11.49 q/ha which is equivalent to the national average (11.17q/ha). Mustard has been a traditionally important oilseed crop in the India. It is a major Rabi crop. Cultivation of mustard is between October-November and February-March. Major growing areas are Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh, and Haryana. Broadly seven varieties of mustard rapeseed are grown in India. Most popular varieties grown in Indian subcontinent are *Brassica juncea*, *Brassica campestris* and *Brassica napus*.

2. MATERIALS AND METHOD:

The study was conducted in the cd block Nandgaon districts of Mathura Five villages where FLDs conducted by Mathura KVK as treated villages and five villages where no such demonstrations conducted by Mathura KVK as control villages were selected from purposively selected Nandgaon block of Mathura district for the purpose of this study. Two types of respondents were selected from these villages: (i) FLD farmers and (ii) non-FLD farmers. The FLD farmers were those on whose fields FLDs on mustard were conducted and non-FLD farmers were those on whose fields FLDs on mustard were not conducted. From each group, 55 farmers were randomly selected. The total sample, therefore, consisted 110 respondents' farmers in both the group for collection of data. The data was collected through a well-structured and pre- tested interview schedule. The collected data were statistically analyzed by using appropriate statistical tools like percentage, mean, correlation coefficient

3. RESULT AND DISCUSSION:

Table: 1 Socio-economic status of the beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries:

		Beneficiaries		Non-beneficiaries	
S.N	Socio-economic status	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
1	Low (9-14)	13	23.64	23	41.81
2	Medium (15-20)	25	45.46	21	38.19
3	High (21-26)	17	30.90	11	20.00
	Total	55	100.00	55	100.00

The data in table shows that beneficiary respondents (45.46%) had medium socio-economic status followed by high (30.90%) and low (23.64%) of socio-economic status and in case of non-beneficiary respondents (41.81%) had low

socio-economic status followed by medium (38.19%) and only (20.00%) had high socio-economic status similar finding also reported by **Raghavendra, K.M. (2010)**.

Table: 2 Knowledge of beneficiaries farmers regarding mustard production practices

S.N	Recommended practices	Fully correct	Partial correct	Incorrect
1.	Land preparation and ploughing of farm	28 (50.90%)	17 (30.90%)	10 (18.20%)
2.	Improved varieties of mustard	26 (47.28%)	22 (40%)	07 (12.72%)
3.	Sowing of seed	39 (70.90%)	12 (21.81%)	4 (7.29%)
4.	Knowledge of seed rate and treatment	28 (50.90%)	22 (40%)	05 (9.10%)
5	Seed spacing Row to row and plant to plant	18 (32.72%)	26 (47.28%)	11 (20%)
6	Recommended dose of fertilizers	25 (45.45%)	16 (29.10%)	14 (25.45%)
7	Use of bio-fertilizers	8 (14.55%)	19 (34.55%)	28 (50.90%)
8	Weedicide and their use	18 (32.72%)	22 (40%)	15 (27.28%)

Table: 3 level of knowledge of beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries regarding mustard production practices

S.N	Beneficiaries			Non-beneficiaries		
	Level of knowledge	Frequency	Percentage	Level of knowledge	Frequency	Percentage
1	Low level (31-41)	12	21.20	Low level (21-31)	25	45.46
2	Medium level (42-51)	20	36.40	Medium level (32-42)	19	34.54
3	High level (52-62)	23	42.40	High level (43-53)	11	20.00
	Total	55	100.00	Total	55	100.00

Thus, it may be concluded that beneficiary respondents had high level of knowledge followed by medium and low level of knowledge regarding mustard production practices and in case of non-beneficiaries had low level of knowledge behaviour followed by medium and high level of knowledge regarding Mustard production practices Similar finding also reported by **Chand (1993) and Jadhav and aski (2014)**

4. FINDINGS:

Majority of the beneficiary farmers had found in middle (52.72%) followed by old 27.28 per cent age group while maximum percentage of Non-beneficiaries farmers were having middle 47.28 per cent followed by old 36.36 per cent age group. maximum beneficiary farmers had education level up to middle education 34.54 per cent followed by 25.46 per cent primary education while maximum percentage of non-beneficiaries farmers were having illiterate 32.72 per cent followed by 25.45 per cent primary education. Majority of the beneficiaries farmers had found in small farmers (52.72%) followed by marginal 34.54 per cent farmers while maximum percentage of Non-beneficiaries farmers were having small 49.09 per cent followed by marginal 43.63 per cent farmers. maximum beneficiaries had found in high level of experience 38.18 per cent followed by medium 27.28 per cent level of experience while

maximum percentage of Non-beneficiaries farmers were having medium 45.45 per cent followed by high 27.28 per cent level of experience. maximum beneficiaries farmers had found in medium 47.27 per cent followed by high 27.28 per cent income group while majority of Non-beneficiaries farmers were having low (50.90 %) followed by medium 34.55 per cent income group. Maximum beneficiaries had found in medium farm power 43.63 per cent followed by low 32.72 per cent farm power while majority of the Non-beneficiaries farmers were having low (50.90%) followed by medium 30.90 per cent farm power. Maximum beneficiary farmers had found in Low economic motivation 41.81 per cent followed by medium 34.54 per cent farm power while majority of the Non-beneficiary farmers were having low (52.72%) followed by medium 32.72 per cent economic motivation. Maximum beneficiaries had found in medium innovativeness 43.63 per cent followed by high 29.09 per cent innovativeness category while majority of the Non-beneficiaries farmers were having medium (50.90%) followed by low 36.37 per cent innovativeness category. maximum beneficiaries had found 40.00 per cent in high level of information seeking behaviour followed by medium 34.54 per cent information seeking behaviour while maximum percentage of Non-beneficiaries farmers were having low 45.46 per cent followed by medium 32.73 per cent information seeking behaviour. maximum beneficiaries had found in medium mass media exposure 40.00 per cent followed by 30.90 per cent high mass media exposure while maximum percentage of Non-beneficiaries farmers were having low 41.18 per cent followed by 36.38 per cent medium mass media exposure category. Maximum beneficiary farmers had found 47.27 per cent in medium extension participation followed by 29.10 per cent high extension participation while maximum percentage of Non-beneficiaries farmers were having low 45.46 per cent followed by 40.00 per cent medium extension participation category. The FLD beneficiaries had relatively higher level of socio-economic status than those of non-beneficiaries, beneficiaries had found medium level 45.46 per cent followed by high level socio-economic status 30.90 per cent and in case of non-beneficiaries had found 41.81 per cent low socio-economic status followed by medium level 38.19 per cent socio-economic status. The FLD beneficiary farmers had relatively higher level of knowledge than those of the non-beneficiary farmers with respect to all the components of mustard production practices Maximum beneficiary farmers had found in high level 42.40 per cent of knowledge followed by medium level 36.40 per cent and low 21.20 per cent level of knowledge while maximum percentage of Non-beneficiaries farmers were having low 45.46 per cent followed by medium 34.54 per cent and high 20.00 per cent level of knowledge category.

5. CONCLUSION:

It is concluded that FLD beneficiary had medium socio-economic status followed by high socio-economic status and in case of non-beneficiary respondents had found low socio-economic status followed by medium level socio-economic status, FLD beneficiary farmers had higher level of knowledge while non-beneficiaries had lower level of knowledge

REFERENCES:

1. Chand, S. (1993). "An impact study in relation to adoption of improved practices the farmers in Bharatpur district (Raj.)".M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis, RAU, Bikaner, Campus : Udaipur.
2. Jadhav and aski.(2014) analysis of constraints in adoption of recommended practices of chilli cultivation by the farmers of panchayat samiti sambher lake of Jaipur district (Rajasthan).M.sc Ag Thesis, R.A.U campus
3. Raghavendra,K.M. (2010). An impact study on farmer's knowledge and adoption level of sunflower frontline demonstrations (FLDs") in Bijapur district of Karnataka. M.Sc (Agri.) Thesis, Univ. Agric. Sci., Dharwad, Karnataka (India).
4. Shrivastava, R.; Shrivastava, K.K.; Shrivastava, P.; Sarkar, J.D. (2009). Impact of socio- economic traits on adoption of disease control measure in rice. Journal of Soils and Crops; 2009. 19: 2, 214-218. 11 ref.
5. Teggelli, Raju G.; Patil, D.H.; Ananda; Naik; Zaheer Ahamed, B. and Patil, M.C. (2015). Impact of Frontline Demonstration on the yield and economics of pigeonpea in Kalaburgi district of Karnataka State. I.J.S.N. 6(2):224-227.