

Technological Gap of Contact and Non-contact Farmers in Summer Groundnut Cultivation

S. R. Kosambi¹, M. S. Trivedi², and M. N. Popat³

Introduction

T&V System is an important program of State Department of Agriculture for technology transfer. The contact farmer is crucial non-official link between the lowest hierarchy of government change agents and the farmers at large. If this link becomes weak, the effectiveness of the T&V System is affected.

In Panchmahal district, summer groundnut is an important oilseed crop. Though, modern inputs such as hybrid seed, insecticides and chemical fertilizers play a crucial role for increasing production; the farmers are not using them as recommended. This results in to lower productivity of groundnut.

The technologies for summer groundnut production are being communicated to the contact farmers under T&V System, who, in turn, communicate these technologies to other non-contact farmers. The present study was undertaken to find out the technological gap in recommendation practices for summer groundnut practices, between the two groups of farmers.

Methodology

The present study was conducted in three talukas viz., Godhra, Shehara and

Lunawada of Panchmahal district considering the maximum acreage of summer groundnut. Three villages of Godhara, four villages of Shehara and eight villages of Lunawada taluka were randomly selected. Five contact and five non contact farmers who are growing summer groundnut crop for last three years were randomly selected from each selected village. Thus, the sample constitutes of 75 contact and 75 non contact farmers. The data were collected by personal interview method with the help of structural scheduled. Nine improved practices of summer groundnut cultivation were identified to know the level of adoption which was used to measure the technological gap.

The technological gap index for each of the practices as well as overall technological gap for all the respondent was calculated with the help of formula developed by Dubey *et al* (1981).

Result and Discussion

Technological Gap

The data regarding technological gap for different components of summer groundnut technology in contact and non contact farmers are presented in Table 1.

¹ Ex Post Graduate Student, Extension Education Institute, GAU, Anand

^{2&3} Associate Extension Educationist, Extension Education Institute, GAU, Anand

Table 1: Technological gap for different components of summer groundnut cultivation

Sr. No.	Technological components	Contact Farmers		Non-contact farmers	
		Technological Gap	Rank	Technological Gap	Rank
1	Variety	00.00	VIII	16.00	VIII
2	Seed rate	25.33	VII	38.66	VII
3	Seed Treatment	65.40	III	77.33	III
4	Spacing	32.00	VI	72.00	IV
5	Chemical fertilizer	43.15	V	56.46	VI
6	Hand weeding	00.00	VIII	00.00	IX
7	Chemical weed control	92.81	I	97.13	I
8	Irrigation	55.57	IV	63.13	V
9	Plant protection	69.07	II	82.40	II
	Overall gap	42.65		55.96	

The technological gap was found to be varied from component to component. The technological gap was ranging from 0.00 to 92.87 per cent in contact farmers; while in case of non-contact farmers it was ranging from 00.00 to 97.13 per cent.

Contact Farmers :

The maximum technological gap was observed in chemical weed control (92.87 per cent) followed by plant protection measures (69.07 per cent). There was medium gap in seed treatment (65.40 per cent), Irrigation (55.57 per cent) and chemical fertilizers (43.15 per cent). Technologies regarding varieties as well as hand weeding were adopted fully.

Non-contact Farmers :

In non-contact farmers, the maximum technological gap was found in chemical weed control (97.13 per cent) followed by plant protection (82.40 percent), seed treatment (73.33 per cent) and spacing (72.00 per cent). There was medium technological gap in irrigation (63.13 per cent), chemical fertilizers (56.46 per cent) and recommended seed rate (38.66 per cent). No technological gap was

found in hand weeding.

It is obvious from the table that there is a clear gap between contact and non-contact farmers, except for the technologies of hand weeding. The higher technological gap at contact farmers' level indicated that the technologies are either not being taken to the farmers or that the technologies are not viable at farmers' fields; that restricts the farmers to adopt it.

Conclusion

Technological gap was observed for many contact as well as non-contact farmers. No technological gap was observed with contact farmers for varieties and hand weeding. Similarly, for hand weeding, no technological gap was found for non-contact farmers too. The overall technological gap was found to be 42.65 per cent and 55.96 per cent for contact and non-contact farmers, respectively. Necessary efforts shall be taken up at the level of extension system so as to make the system more effective. The frontline TOT system of the SAUs shall also make efforts for refinement of technologies so as to make them location specific.