## Differential Perception of Farm Practice Attributes by Adopters and Non-adopters

Apodaca (1952) in his study of hybrid corn rejection by Mexican-American farmers found that change agents perceived the corn seed mainly in terms of its higher yield, while farmers perceived it as a poor food. Kivlin and Fliegel (1967) in their study on differential perception of innovation concluded that there were important differences in how each sample of large and small size farmers perceived the same innovation. Roy and Jaiswal (1969) concluded that the three groups of respondents namely, research workers, extension workers and farmers perceived the characteristics of innovations based upon their background, experience and selectivity of percep-Thus differential perception of farmers appears to have an important bearing on the adoption of new ideas. Considering this, a study was undertaken to find out the differential perception of farm practice attributes between the adopters and non-adopters of selected farm practices under the condition prevailing in Tamil Nadu state.

The study was conducted in the year 1972-73 in Pattukkottai block of Tamil Nadu state. A sample of 100 farmers was drawn by a multi-stage stratified random sampling and the data were collected by interviewing the respondents with the help of pre-tested interview schedule.

Variables: Six farm practices namely, use of IR 8 paddy, use of nitrogenous fertilizer, use of zinc phos-

phide, adoption of multiple cropping, use of improved implement-Burmese setturn and use of power sprayer and eight farm practice attributes such as cost, profitability, compatibility, communicability, efficiency, feasibility, complexity and divisibility were selected for this study. Adopters and nonadopters of the practices were asked to self-rate their perception of farm practice attributes in a 5 point scale with reference to each farm practice. The five points of the attribute scale were: very high, high, undecided. low and very low. The calculated mean perception score of adopters and nonadopters, difference in mean, standard error of difference and 't' value are given in Table 1 for each of the six farm practices.

The 't' test reveals that the difference in perception between adopters and non-adopters was consistently significant in all the six practices. The difference in the mean perception score between adopters and non-adopters ranged from 4.25 for the practice 'use of IR 8 Paddy' to 10.12 for the practice use of power sprayer'. The high range of differences was found in the four farm practices namely use of sprayer, use of nitrogenous fertilizer, use of Burmese setturn and adoption of multiple cropping, indicating the strong influence of the farm practice attributes on the adoption of these practices. Comparatively, the impact of farm practice attributes was less in the remaining two practices namely use of IR 8 paddy use of zinc phosphide.

Table 1. Differential perception of attributes by adopters and non-adopters of farm practices

vino ed a Practice reper tour sons de la composition della composition de la composition della composition della composi	Mean score		Mean	Standard	noople si tu
	Adopt- ers	Non-adop- ters	differ- ence	error of difference	t' value
Raising IR 8 paddy in samba lands	23.16	18.91	4.25	0.43	9.907**
Application of nitrogenous fertilizer for paddy	32.34	24.00	8.34	hout much taken <u>s</u> ap of efforts	Not worked out
Use of zinc phosphide for the	· noitto				imposed by data
control of field rats	31.56	26.00	5.56	0.67	8.247**
Adoption of multiple cropping	32.22	24.80	7.42	0.93	7.978**
Use of Burmese setturn for puddling	33.85	26.42	7.43	0.56	Alax alp \$6100
Use of power sprayer for spraying and dusting	29.68	19.56	10.12	0.56 0.50	12.697**

DF . 98

't' value : Significent at I per cent level.

The study concludes that the farmers are more likely to adopt the farm practices when they perceive the practices to be more compatible, more efficient and feasible, more communicable, simple to adopt, less costly, highly divisible and more profitable.

The senior author is thankful to the Tamil Nadu Agricultural University for the permission accorded for this publication.

K. CHANDRAKANDAN 23b. 3d burga gama V. S. SUBRAMANYAN

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

## REFERENCES 10 Charles

APODACA, AMACLETS. 1952. Corn and custom: Introduction of Hybrid corn to Spanish American Farmers in New Mexico. Edward H. Spicer (ed) Human Problems in Technological change, New York Russell Sege Fdn-

KIVLIN JOSEPH, E. and F. C. FLIEGEL. 1967. "Differential perception of innovations and rate of adoption". Rur. Soc., 32:78-91.

ROY, N. K. and N. K. JAISWAL. 1969. "Characteristics of Agricultural innovation as perceived by farmers, Extension workers". ManasThe Jour. of Scientific Psychology, Delhi.