

Utilization of Sources and Channels by Adopters and Non-Adopters for Sugarcane Cultivation

By

K. NANJAIYAN¹, V. SRINIVASAN² and J. OLIVER³

ABSTRACT

The present study aims at finding out the different sources and channels utilized by the adopters and non-adopters and their influence on the farmers in the adoption of recommended practices for sugarcane. The study revealed that the adoption and non-adoption had no association with utilization of sources and channels. However, non-adopters utilized more of informal sources than the adopters with respect to all practices. Adopters utilized more of formal sources and channels and less of personal experience.

INTRODUCTION

The importance of farm information to farmers in the adoption of improved agricultural practices has been recognised with increased impetus to agricultural development work in Community Development Blocks. Majority of the farmers do not adopt all the recommended practices. The present study was taken up in Karamadai block of Coimbatore district to find out whether the adopters and non-adopters differ in the utilization of different sources and channels.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study was undertaken in Karamadai Block of Coimbatore district which was selected on purposive sampling method. Villages were selected based on the area under sugarcane in the year 1971 - 72. The villages were listed with the area under sugar-

cane and five villages having maximum area were selected. The respondents were selected by proportionate sampling technique based on the total number of sugarcane growers in the selected villages. A total of 120 respondents were selected from the list of farmers who have cultivated sugarcane in the year 1971 - 72 at random.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

All the 120 respondents selected for the study (Table 1) had adopted the recommended variety and season. Seventy per cent of them adopted the practice by utilizing channels and informal sources, whereas 19.17 per cent and 10.83 per cent utilized formal sources and personal experience respectively. A few farmers only (15.39 per cent) had adopted the practice seed treatment. Channels were utilized by 64.28 per cent, formal sources by 28.57 per cent and informal sources by 7.15

1. Instructor 2. Associate Professor and 3. Assistant Professor, Department of Agricultural Extension Education, Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Coimbatore-641003.

Table 1. Utilization of sources and channels by adopters and non-adopters

Practice	Adoption	Formal (%)	Informal (%)	Channels (%)	Personal experience (%)	Total (%)	f ² value
Variety and season	Adopters	19.17	30.83	39.17	10.83	100.00	Not calculated
	Non-adopters	—	—	—	—	—	
	Total	19.17	30.83	39.17	10.83	100.00	
Seed treatment	Adopters	28.57	7.15	64.28	—	15.39	0.59 NS
	Non-adopters	10.39	36.36	53.25	—	84.61	
	Total	13.19	31.87	54.94	—	100.00	
Seed rate and spacing	Adopters	16.67	27.78	38.89	16.66	58.69	0.78 NS
	Non-adopters	15.79	31.58	42.10	10.53	41.31	
	Total	16.30	29.35	40.22	14.13	100.00	

NS—Not significant

per cent of the adopters. In the case of non-adopters, 53.25 per cent of them utilized channels, 36.36 per cent informal sources and 10.39 per cent formal sources. From the study it was found out that there was no relationship in the utilization of different sources between adopters and non-adopters. As such it is obvious that adoption is independent of the utilisation of sources and channels. There was no marked difference in the utilisation of channels of communication, informal and formal sources by the adopters and non-adopters for the practice seed rate and spacing. However, adopters were found to be slightly superior to non-adopters in utilizing personal experience. From the analysis, it was found that adoption had no association with utilization of sources and channels.

Among the adopters of the practice, fertilizer application, 75 per cent had relied on their own experience, 17.86 per cent utilized channels and 7.14 per cent utilized formal sources. Utilization of channels was more by the non-adopters (Table 2). Informal sources were utilized by 9.88 per cent of non-adopters whereas none among adopters had utilized this source. But there is not much variation in the utilization of formal sources between adopters and non-adopters. From the statistical analysis of the data, it was found that adopters and non-adopters did not differ in the utilization of sources and channels in the case of fertilizer application. With respect to intercropping with sunnhemp 40.21 per cent and 36.08 per cent utilized channels of communication and informal sources respectively. But for-

SOURCES AND CHANNELS BY ADOPTERS AND NON-ADOPTERS
FOR SUGARCANE CULTIVATION

Table 2. Utilization of sources and channels by adopters and non-adopters

f ² value	Practice	Adoption	Formal %	Informal %	Channels %	Personal experience %	Total %	f ² Value
Not calculated	Fertilizer application	Adopters	7.14	—	17.86	75.00	31.46	3.51 NS
		Non-adopters	9.83	9.88	26.22	54.07	68.54	
		Total	8.99	6.74	23.60	60.67	100.00	
0.59 NS	Intercropping with sunnhemp	Adopters	35.29	11.77	23.53	29.41	16.53	0.10 NS
		Non-adopters	10.00	41.25	43.75	5.00	83.47	
		Total	14.43	36.08	40.21	9.28	100.00	
0.78 NS	Foliar spray with urea	Adopters	23.08	0	30.77	46.15	15.67	3.54 NS
		Non-adopters	12.86	38.57	41.43	7.14	84.33	
		Total	14.45	32.54	39.76	13.25	100.00	
	Plant protection measures	Adopters	21.21	36.36	42.43	—	35.86	0.62 NS
		Non-adopters	15.26	42.37	42.37	—	64.14	
		Total	17.39	40.22	42.39	—	100.00	

NS—Not significant

mal sources and personal experience had been utilized to the maximum by the farmers (14.43 and 9.28 per cent)

It is seen that formal sources, personal experience and channels were the sources utilized by the adopters to a large extent while channels and informal sources were utilized by more than 80 per cent of non-adopters. From the study it was found out that there was no association in the utilization of sources and channels between adopters and non-adopters as far as the practice intercropping with sunnhemp is concerned.

In the case of the practice "Foliar spray with urea" 84.33 per cent were non-adopters and only 15.67 per cent were adopters. In the utilization of the sources, adopters were found to utilize personal experience while non-adopters used channels.

The study revealed that there was no significant association between the adoption and channels utilized by the farmers. There was not much difference between adopters and non-adopters in utilizing channels, informal and formal sources for the practice, plant

protection measures. None among the three categories utilized personal experience as their source of information for this practice. Further adoption had no bearing in the utilisation of sources and channels for the practice plant protection measures. Non-adopters utilized more of informal sources than the adopters with respect to all practices whereas in the case of utilizing personal experi-

ence, adopters were found to be superior to non-adopters.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The senior author expresses his gratitude to the Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Coimbatore, for according permission for this publication which formed a part of the M. Sc. (Ag.) dissertation.