## Adopters and Non-adopters of Package of Practices for Sugarcane

The acceptance of new farm practices by the majority of farmers takes generally a long time depending on the nature of the farm practice, its cost, compatibility etc. Of these, adoption of recommended practices in the cultivation of every crop is of vital importance.

The present study was undertaken in Karamadai block of Coimbatore district during the year 1972-73, One hundred and twenty sugarcane growers were selected by proportionate sampling technique based on the total number of sugarcane growers in the

selected five villages. Seven package of practices, namely variety and season seed treatment, seed rate and spacing, fertilizer application, intercropping with sunnhemp, foliar spray with urea and plant protection measures were studied with relation to the awareness and adoption. Awareness and non-awareness categories of farmers were identified for each practice and their adoption was studied and presented in Table I.

It is evident from Table I that all the 120 respondents selected for the study were aware and had adopted

Table 1. Adopters and non-adopters

Name of the practice	Aware Adopters	(n=120)		Not aware
		Non-adopters	Total	Non-adopters
Variety and season	100	nil	100	nil
Seed treatment	15.38	84.62	75.83	24.17
Seed rate and spacing	58.70	41.30	76.67	23.33
Fertilizer application	31.46	68.54	74.17	25.83
ntercropping with sunnhemp	17.53	82.47	80.83	19.17
Foliar spray with urea	15.66	84.34	69.17	30.83
Plant protection measures	35.87	64.13	76.67	23.33

the recommended varieties like Co 419 and Co 449 in February-March and April-May. Eventhough more than three-fourths of the farmers were aware of seed treatment, only 15.38 per cent were found adopting this practice. This could be due to the fact that the damage caused by the diseases of sugarcane was not severe in this area. Most of the farmers (76.67 per cent) were aware of the correct seed rate and spacing. Among them 58.70 per cent were adopters and 41.30 per cent were non-adopters. It was also found that most of the non-adopters had adopted excess seed rate because of poor germination of the setts and excess rains received at the time of planting. The practice of application of correct doses of fertilizers was known to 74.17 per cent of the respondents. However, nearly two thirds of them were found to be non-adopters because the fertilizer dose recommended by the department was found too high and that the application of the same resulted in lodging of the crop. Among the 80.83 per cent of farmers who were aware of intercropping with sunnhemp, only 17.53 per cent had adopted this practice. However, most of the nonadopters had grown sunnhemp before planting sugarcane. Eventhough the details of foliar spray with urea were known to nearly 70 per cent of the respondents, 84.34 per cent of them were found to be non-adopters because of its cumbersomeness and more technicality. Out of 76.67 percent of the farmers who were aware of plant protection messures for sugar-

cane, only 35.87 per cent were adopters of the same. The reason for non-adoption of plant protection measures by the majority of the farmers was that the damage caused to the crop by the pests and diseases was negligible.

The study reveals that most of the sugarcane growers had adopted the recommended sugarcane varieties and season whereas only 58.70 percent of the respondents had adopted the recommented seed rate and spacing. For the remaining five practices, the adoption percentage varied from 15.38 to 35.87 per cent. The reasons for this could be that the damage caused by the pests and diseases was minimum, recommended dosage of fertilizers was not applicable to them etc.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The senior author expresses his gratitude to the Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Coimbatore-3 for the kind permission accorded to publish the work which formed part of the dissertation during the post-graduate study.

K. NANJAIYAN
V. SRINIVASAN
J. OLIVER

Department of Agricultural Extension, Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Coimbatore-641003.