

A STUDY ON CHARACTERISTICS OF IMPROVED FARM PRACTICES AS RELATED TO RATE AND EXTENT OF ADOPTION."

THESIS

Submitted in fulfilment for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in Agriculture (Agril. Extension) of the

KANPUR UNIVERSITY

1972

By


SATYA NARAIN TRIPATHI



Division of Agricultural Extension and Training
U. P. INSTITUTE OF AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES
KANPUR - 2

C E R T I F I C A T E

I hereby certify that this thesis entitled " A study on characteristics of improved farm practices as related to rate and extent of adoption" submitted to The Faculty of Agriculture, Kanpur University, Kanpur for the award of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Agricultural Extension, is a record of bonafide research work carried out by Sri S.N.Tripathi under my guidance and supervision. No part of the thesis has been submitted for any other degree or diploma. It is further certified that such help or sources of information, as have been availed of during the course of investigation, have been duly acknowledged by him.


(Daulat Singh)
Supervisor,
Professor and Head,
Division of Agricultural Extension
and Training,
U.P. Institute of Agricultural Sciences,
Kanpur.

Kanpur:

Dated The 28th Nov., 1972.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

It gives me immense pleasure in expressing my deep sense of gratitude and sincere appreciation to Dr. Daulat Singh, M.Sc.(Ag.), M.S. (U.S.A.), Ph.D., Professor and Head, Division of Agricultural Extension and Training and my revered teacher for his sustained interest, learned counsel, untiring help, valuable guidance, kind encouragement and constructive criticism throughout the period of this investigation and preparing thesis. I am thankful to him for providing necessary facilities to carry out the work.

I am grateful to Dr. K.N.Singh, Head and Dr.C. Prasad, Professor, Division of Agricultural Extension, Indian Agricultural Research Institute, New Delhi, Dr. P.R.R.Sinha, Director, National Institute of Community Development, Hyderabad, Dr. Y.P. Singh, Professor and Head, Department of Extension Education, Agricultural University, Hissar, Haryana, Dr. T.S.Schal, Professor and Head, Department of Extension Education, Punjab Agricultural University, Ludhiana, Punjab and Dr.(Mrs.) S.Mulay, former Reader, Department of Adult Education, NCERT, New Delhi, for their valuable comments and suggestions at the time of preparing the final synopsis.

Sincere thanks are due to Mr.S.Kapoor, Programmer, Computer Section, Indian Institute of Technology, Kanpur

for preparing the Computer Programme for statistical analysis.

I am very much thankful to my friends who helped me directly or indirectly throughout this investigation.

I record my sincere thanks to Sri J.S.Pandey, Lecturer in English, U.P.Institute of Agricultural Sciences, Kanpur for his kind help in correction of the English.


I owe a deep debt of gratitude to my parents and wife for their constant and continuous support and encouragement during my stay at U.P.Institute of Agricultural Sciences, Kanpur for pursuing the Doctoral programme since February, 1970.

I am indebted to all the respondents, drawn from two districts of the State for their ready co-operation during the collection of data for the study.

I am thankful to the Agriculture Department, Government of Uttar Pradesh, for providing financial assistance in the form of a fellowship.

Lastly, I am very much obliged to Dr.Dharampal Singh, Director, U.P.Institute of Agricultural Sciences, Kanpur, for providing me necessary facilities during the period of this study.

Kanpur: November ,1972.


(Satya Narain Tripathi)

C O N T E N T S

<u>Chapter</u>		<u>Pages</u>
I	<u>INTRODUCTION</u>	1-15
II	<u>REVIEW OF LITERATURE</u>	16-80
III	<u>RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODS</u>	81-121
IV	<u>FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION</u>	122-265
V	<u>SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS</u>	266-298
VI	<u>BIBLIOGRAPHY</u>	1- 20
VII	<u>APPENDICES</u>	29- 48



LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table No.</u>	<u>Particulars</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
1	Distribution of respondents on the basis of size of holding.	93
2	Caste classification of selected respondents	94
3	Distribution of the respondents on the basis of level of education.	94
4.	Categories of adopters based on the observed distribution of adoption scores	123
5	Frequency distribution of cost of the innovation on the adoption of seven selected practices.	132
6	Frequency distribution of simplicity-complexity on the adoption of seven selected improved farm practices	134
7	Frequency distribution of physical-compatibility on the adoption of seven selected practices	136
8	Frequency distribution of profitability on the adoption of seven selected practices	138
9	Frequency distribution of communicability on the adoption of seven selected practices	140
10	Frequency distribution of cultural compatibility on the adoption of seven selected practices.	142
11	Frequency distribution of durability on the adoption of seven selected practices	144

Contd.

<u>Table No.</u>	<u>Particulars</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
12	Correlation coefficient between the dependent variable Y (adoption score of improved farm practices) and each one of the independent variables $X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4, X_5, X_6, X_8$, (Characteristics score) for seven practices.	148
13	Zero-order intercorrelation among independent variables in relation to dwarf wheat	158
14	Zero-order intercorrelation among independent variables in relation to potato	160
15	Zero-order intercorrelation among independent variables in relation to nitrogenous fertiliser	162
16	Zero-order intercorrelation among independent variables in relation to diamophos	163
17	Zero-order intercorrelation among independent variables in relation to compost or F.Y.M.	165
18	Zero order intercorrelation among independent variables in relation to seed treatment	167
19	Zero-order intercorrelation among independent variables in relation to thresher	169
20A	Coefficient of partial regression and multiple determination with four independent variables (X_1, X_3, X_4 , and X_8) in relation to dwarf wheat	173
20B	Significance of coefficient of multiple determination of four independent variables (X_1, X_3, X_4 , and X_8) in relation to dwarf wheat	174
21A	Coefficient of partial regression and multiple determination with respect to three variables (X_1, X_3 , and X_8) in relation to dwarf wheat	175

<u>Table No.</u>	<u>Particulars</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
21B	Significance of the coefficient of multiple determination of three independent variables (X_1, X_2 and X_3) in relation to dwarf wheat.	176
22A	Coefficient of partial regression and multiple determination with six independent variables (X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4, X_5 and X_6) in relation to potato	179
22B	Significance of coefficient of multiple determination of six independent variables (X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4, X_5 , and X_6) in relation to potato	180
23A	Coefficient of partial regression and multiple determination with three independent variables (X_2, X_3 and X_4) in relation to potato	182
23B	Significance of the coefficient of multiple determination of three independent variables (X_2, X_3 and X_4) in relation to potato	183
24A	Coefficient of partial regression and multiple determination with four independent variables (X_1, X_2, X_3 and X_4) in relation to nitrogenous fertiliser	185
24B	Significance of coefficient of multiple determination of four independent variables (X_1, X_2, X_3 and X_4) in relation to nitrogenous fertiliser	186
25A	Coefficient of partial regression and multiple determination with two independent variables (X_1 and X_2) in relation to nitrogenous fertiliser	188

<u>Table No.</u>	<u>Particulars</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
25B	Significance of coefficient of multiple determination of the two variables (X_1 & X_3) in relation to nitrogenous fertilizers	189
26A	Coefficient of partial regression and multiple determination with five independent variables (X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4 and X_5) in relation to diamophos	191
26B	Significance of coefficient of multiple determination with five independent variables (X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4 and X_5) in relation to diamophos	193
27A	Coefficient of partial regression and multiple determination with two independent variables (X_1 and X_4) in relation to diamophos	194
27B	Significance of coefficient of multiple determination of two variables (X_1 and X_4) with regards to diamophos	195
28A	Coefficient of partial regression and multiple determination with four independent variables (X_1, X_4, X_5 and X_8) with regards to compost or F.Y.M.	196
28B	Significance of coefficient of multiple determination with four independent variables (X_1, X_3, X_5 and X_8) in relation to compost or F.Y.M.	197
29A	Coefficient of partial regression and multiple determination with three independent variables (X_1, X_4 and X_8) with regards to compost or FIM	199
29B	Significance of coefficient of multiple determination with three independent variables (X_1, X_4 , and X_8) in relation to compost or FIM	200

Contd.

<u>Table No.</u>	<u>Particulars</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
30A	Coefficient of partial regression and multiple determination with four independent variables (X_1, X_3, X_4 and X_5) in relation to seed treatment.	202
30B	Significance of coefficient of multiple determination of four variables (X_1, X_3, X_4 , and X_5) in relation to seed treatment	203
31A	Coefficient of partial regression and multiple determination with two independent variables (X_1 and X_4) in relation to seed treatment	204
31B	Significance of coefficient of multiple determination of two independent variables (X_1 and X_4) with regards to seed treatment	206
32A	Coefficient of partial regression and multiple determination with four independent variables (X_1, X_2, X_5 and X_8) in relation to thresher	208
32B	Significance of coefficient of multiple determination of four independent variables (X_1, X_2, X_5 and X_8) with regards to thresher	209
33A	Coefficient of partial regression and multiple determination with three independent variables (X_1, X_2 , and X_5) in relation to thresher	210
33B	Significance of coefficient of multiple determination of three independent variables (X_1, X_2 , and X_5) in relation to thresher	211
34	Coefficient of partial regression and multiple determination with respect to seven improved farm practices	213

<u>Table No.</u>	<u>Particulars</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
35	Classification of respondents falling under different socio-economic status categories	217
36A	Perception of different socio-economic status groups in relation to characteristics of dwarf wheat	218
36B	Differences between socio-economic status groups in relation to characteristics of dwarf wheat	220
37A	Perception of different socio-economic status groups in relation to characteristics of potato	223
37B	Differences between socio-economic status groups in relation to characteristics of potato	224
38A	Perception of different socio-economic status groups in relation to characteristics of nitrogenous fertiliser	226
38B	Differences between socio-economic status groups in relation to characteristics of nitrogenous fertiliser	227
39A	Perception of different socio-economic status groups in relation to characteristics of the diamophos	229
39B	Differences between socio-economic status groups in relation to characteristics of Diamophos	230
40A	Perception of different socio-economic status groups in relation to the characteristics of the compost or FYM	232

<u>Table No.</u>	<u>Particulars</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
40B	Differences between socio-economic status groups in relation to characteristics of Compost or FYM	233
41A	Perception of different socio-economic status groups in relation to characteristics of the seed treatment	235
41B	Differences between socio-economic status groups in relation to characteristics of the seed treatment	236
42A	Perception of different socio-economic status groups in relation to characteristics of the thresher	238
42B	Differences between socio-economic status groups in relation to characteristics of the thresher	239
43	The variability in perception of farmers for different selected improved farm practices of an individual characteristic	241
44A	Differences between practices with regards to cost of the innovation (X_1)	242
44B	Differences between practices with regards to simplicity-complexity(X_2)	244
44C	Differences between practices with regards to physical compatibility (X_3)	245
44D	Differences between practices with regards to profitability (X_4)	247
44E	Differences between practices with regards to communicability	248

Contd.

<u>Table No.</u>	<u>Particulars</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
44F	Differences between practices with regards to cultural compatibility	250
44G	Differences between practices with regards to divisibility (X_7)	251
44H	Differences between practices with regards to durability (X_8)	252
45	'P' matrix for eight statements judged by 290 respondents	254
46	The 'P' matrix corresponding to the 'F' matrix of table 45	255
47	The 'Z' matrix corresponding to the 'P' matrix of table 46	256

..

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

<u>Figures</u>	<u>Particulars</u>	<u>Between pages</u>
1	Map of Kanpur district	83-84
2	Map of Kalyanpur Block	84-85
3	Map of Etawah district	85-86
4	Map of Mahewa block	86-87
5	Distribution of Adoption scores (Frequency in percentage) among four categories of farmers	123-124
6	Distribution of Adoption scores(Frequency in percentage) for seven improved farm practices	124-125
7	Distribution of characteristic scores(Frequency in percentage) of selected improved farm practices on 5-point scale	131-133