

- HARDY, R.W.F., HOLSTEN, R.D., JACKSON, E.K. and BURNS, R.C. 1968. The acetylene ethylene assays for N₂ fixation laboratory and field evaluation. *Plant Physiol.*, 43 : 1185-1207.
- HUMPHRIES, E.C. 1956. Mineral components and ash analysis. In : *Modern methods of plant analysis*. (Ed.) K. Peach and M.c. Tracy. Vol.I Springer verlaug, Berlin, pp. 468-502.
- JACKSON, M.L. 1973. *Soil chemical canalysis*. Prentice Hall of Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi, India, p.498
- KALIDURAI, M. AND KANNAIYAN, S. 1988. Studies on Biomass Production, nodulation and nitrogen fixation in stem nodulating *Sesbania rostrata*. In : *Inter. Symposium on BNF in rice soil*. Central Rice Res. Inst. Cuttack, India (Abst.) p.18.
- PANDEY, R.K. and MORRIS, R.A. 1983. Effect of leguminous green manuring on crop yield in rice based cropping system. Paper presented at Int. Rice Res. Inst. Los Banos, Philippines.
- PONNAMPERUMA, F.N. 1972. The chemistry of submerged soils. *Adv. Agron.*, 24 : 29-96.
- SPILLER, H.J., HANRY, F. and SHANMUGAM, K.T. 1981. Photosynthetic limitation of nitrogen fixation in the blue green alga - *Anabaena variabilis*. In : *Genetic Engineering of symbiotic nitrogen fixation and conservation of fixed nitrogen* (Ed.) J.M. Lyons, R.C. Valentine, D.A. Phillips, D.W. Rains and R.C. Huffakar, Basic life Sciences. Vol. 17, Plenum press, New York, USA pp. 333-341.
- SWARUP, A. 1988. Effect of pre-submergence and green manuring (*Sesbania aculeata*) on nutrition and yield of wet land rice on sodic soil. *Biol. Fertil. Soils*. 5 : 203-208.
- WALKLEY, A. and BLACK, I.A. 1934. An examination of the Daglgareff method for determining soil organic matter and a proposed modification of the chromic acid titration method. *Soil Sci.*, 37 : 29-38.

Madras Agric. J. 79, (3) : 153 - 157 March, 1992

<https://doi.org/10.29321/MAJ.10.A01747>

IMPACT OF MINIKIT DEMONSTRATION - AN ANALYTICAL STUDY

R. ANNAMALAI¹ and V. SEKAR²

ABSTRACT

Minikit demonstrations acted as medium of enriching knowledge and enhance adoption of practices though differential level of knowledge and adoption among small and marginal

1. Professor and Head, Dept. of Agrl. Extn. & Ru. Soc., TNAU, Coimbatore - 3.
2. Asst. Professor, KVK, Virudhachalam.

farmers. Inputs should be supplied in time for better adoption and successful conduct of minikit demonstration.

Minikit program is an extension technique which assumes greater importance in the transfer of new technology to the farmers of different agro-climatic regions. The programme started in 1971-72 with an implementation of a few hundred demonstrations and has been enlarged. Hence, to assess the effective diffusion and adoption of latest technology through minikit demonstration, a study was taken up with the following specific objectives:

1. To know the knowledge level and adoption behaviour of minikit demonstration farmers; and
2. To assess the extent of technological gap in relation to different practices advocated through minikit demonstration.

METHODOLOGY

The study was carried out in the Thanjavur block of Thanjavur District. Sixty marginal farmers and 60 small farmers who laid minikit demonstration were selected randomly and interviewed.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Knowledge is the pre-requisite for the innovation adoption. Differential knowledge levels among the individuals do exist. The differentiation might be due to their differential characteristics. The same is evident from the Table 1.

Majority of farmers (53.33 per cent) were having high level of awareness knowledge. In addition the differential awareness knowledge do not exist among the farmers and it is substantiated by non-significant relationship between marginal and small farmers obtained through 'z' test.

From the Table 2, it may be inferred that the better educated farmers exposed to print media like newspaper, booklets etc., when compared to illiterate farmers. This contributed for the acquisition of more knowledge. This finding is in conformity with the findings of Janakiramraju (1976) and Rajkumar (1981).

Frequent contact of extension personnel helped marginal and small farmers to acquire awareness knowledge.

Economic motivation, scientific orientation and innovativeness had relationship with the awareness knowledge. This might be due to the earnest efforts taken by change agency system.

Table 3 could indicate that majority of marginal farmers (76.77 per cent) and small farmers (78.33 per cent) were having medium level of principles - knowledge. It is a sign to indicate that extension workers have communicated the messages to farmers effectively. This leads to infer that the object of educating farmers through minikit programme has

TABLE 1. Awareness - knowledge of farmers

S.No.	Awareness Knowledge	Marginal farmers		Small farmers		Total	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1.	Low	15	25.00	14	23.33	29	24.17
2.	Medium	19	31.67	8	13.33	27	22.50
3.	High	26	43.33	38	63.34	64	53.55
	Total	60	100.00	60	100.00	120	100.00
	Mean	26.25		26.03		26.14	
	'z' value			1.004	NS		

NS - Non-significant

TABLE 2. Correlation between characteristics of farmers and awareness-knowledge

S.No.	Characteristics	Correlation Marginal farmers (n=60)	Coefficient 'r' Small farmers (n=60)
1.	Education	0.335**	0.384**
2.	Extension agency contact	0.351**	0.368**
3.	Economic motivation	0.356**	0.382**
4.	Scientific orientation	0.438**	0.442**
5.	Innovativeness	0.292*	0.288*

* Significant at 0.05 level of probability

** Significant at 0.01 level of probability

been achieved. As a result there is no significant difference in the awareness and principle knowledge level between marginal and small farmers.

From the Table 4 it may be inferred that farmers with high education, frequent contact with extension workers, and urge to earn more through scientific way might have influenced to gain more principle knowledge.

Innovativeness had exhibited relationship with the only awareness-knowledge. This is because that the change agent might be concentrating in creating awareness-knowledge rather

than instituting principles-knowledge among the farmers.

As observed from the Table 5, majority of farmer (85.64 per cent) were medium in the level of adoption. Due to the difficulties encountered in adopting practices like DAP application to nursery, age of seedling and water management.

Chemical weed control was not adopted by 90.00 per cent of farmers due to high cost. Top dressing neem blended urea could not be followed by many due to non-availability of neem cake.

Table 6 revealed medium was the technological gap existing among small

TABLE 3. Their Principles - knowledge of farmers

S.No.	Principles-Knowledge	Marginal farmers (n = 60)		Small farmers (n = 60)		Total (n = 120)	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1.	Low	6	10.00	2	3.33	8	6.67
2.	Medium	46	76.67	47	78.33	93	77.50
3.	High	8	13.33	11	18.34	19	15.83
	Total	60	100.00	60	100.00	120	100.00
	Mean	7.56		7.76		7.66	
	'z' value			1.302 NS			

NS - Non-significant

TABLE 4. Characteristics of farmers vis-a-vis principles-knowledge

S.No.	Characteristics	Correlation	Coefficient 'r'
		Marginal farmers (n=60)	Small farmers (n=60)
1.	Education	0.325*	0.328*
2.	Extension agency contact	0.286*	0.289*
3.	Economic motivation	0.279*	0.292*
4.	Scientific orientation	0.352*	0.394**
5.	Innovativeness	0.040 NS	0.162 NS

* Significant at 0.05 level of probability

** Significant at 0.01 level of probability

NS Non-significant

and marginal farmers. Though these farmers had become average farmers in adopting farm practices, high gap was found among marginal farmers. This finding is in accordance with the findings of Asaithambi (1977) who reported that majority of the respondents had moderate technological gap.

CONCLUSION

As suggested by farmers, supply of paddy seeds is to be increased to 5 kgs from 2 kgs so that the owe variety could be compared with one. In addition inputs needed for the conduct of demonstration should be made available in the time to facilitate the farmers to adopt the recommended practices.

REFERENCES

- ASAITHAMBI, K. (1981). "A Study on the knowledge level and Adoption Behaviour of Groundnut Growing Farmers". Unpub. M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis; A.C. & R.I., TNAU, Coimbatore.

TABLE 5. Extent of adoption of farmers

S.No.	Extent of adoption	Marginal farmers (n = 60)		Small farmers (n = 60)		Total (n = 120)	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1.	Low	5	8.33	2	3.33	7	5.83
2.	Medium	47	78.33	56	93.34	103	85.85
3.	High	8	13.34	2	3.33	10	8.33
	Total	60	100.00	60	100.00	120	100.00
	Mean	16.78		17.37		17.07	
	'z' value			2.445**			

* Significant at 0.05 level of probability

TABLE 6. Technological gap existed among farmers

S.No.	Degree of technological gap	Marginal farmers (n = 60)		Small farmers (n = 60)		Total (n = 120)	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1.	Low	6	10.00	10	16.67	16	13.32
2.	Medium	49	81.67	48	80.00	97	80.83
3.	High	5	8.33	2	3.33	7	5.84
	Total	60	100.00	60	100.00	120	100.00

JANAKIRAMRAJU, M.N. (1978). "A Study on the Fertilizer Adoption Behaviour of Farmers in Irrigated and Non-irrigated Areas". Unpub. M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis A.C. & R.I., TNAU, Coimbatore.

MANIVANNAN, N. (1980). "A Study on the knowledge and Extent of Adoption

of Sunflower Growers". Unpub. M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis : A.C. & R.I., TNAU, Coimbatore.

RAJKUMAR, N. (1981). "An Evaluation Study of Soil and Water Management Scheme in Madurai District". Unpub. M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis TNAU, Coimbatore.