ADOPTION BEHAVIOUR OF FARM WOMEN ABOUT HOME SCIENCE TECHNOLOGIES

Suman Khandelwal[*]**, Rajendra Rathore**[**]** and S.K. Sharma**[***]

ABSTRACT

The study was connducted in Sikar district of Rajasthan. Total 300 farm women (150 beneficiaries and 150 non beneficiaries) were selected from Laxmangarh and Fatehpur panchayat samities of this district. Personal interview method was used to collect the data. Thereafter the data so collected were tabulated, analyzed and inferences were drawn in light of the objectives. Study reveals that about 46.6 per cent of total respondents had medium level of adoption while 35.00 and 18.33 per cent of total respondents had low and high level of adoption respectively.

INTRODUCTION

One of the most persistent theme in the social sciences and Humanities is the impact of technological change on different aspects of life. Impact involves acceptance of scientific technologies against traditional faith and adoption of new innovations and methods with challenges to compete with the old ones. The prosperity and growth of a nation depends on the status and development of its women as they not only constitute nearly half of its population, but also influence growth of the remaining half of its population.

The Bhartia Krishi Vigyan Kendra, Fatehpur (Sikar) is playing a great role in transferring the latest technologies with the objective to provide need based training to farm women. These trainings have not been evaluated for their impact. A systematic evaluation of training impact is very important to assess achievement of results desired to find out hindering and helping factors and to take measures to improve the programme as a whole and assist participants in increased use of learning's.

Keeping the above facts in view the present study was undertaken with the following specific objectives:

1. Adoption on level of beneficiary and non-beneficiary respondents about Home Science Technologies.
2. Comparison between Adoption of Home Science Technologies by the beneficiary and non-beneficiary respondents.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study was conducted in Sikar district of Rajasthan. Eight villages of two panchayat samities namely Laxmangarh and Fatehpur were selected purposely as training programmes were conducted in these villages during the year 1999-2004. A sample comprising of 300 farm women (150 beneficiaries and 150 non-beneficiaries) was drawn by using random probability proportional allocation techniques. An interview schedule was developed to record the responses of respondents. Personal interview method of data collection was adopted to record the responses of the respondents. The data so collected were tabulated and analyzed. Inferences were drawn after subjecting the data of statistical analysis.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

To get the overall view of adoption level, the respondents were divided into three categories on the basis of calculated mean and standard

* Assistant Professor (HSEE), Bhartia Krishi Vigyan Kendra, Fatehpur-Shekhawati, Sikar (Rajasthan).

** Assistant Professor, Department of Home Science Extension and Communication Management, College of Home Science, SKRAU, Bikaner – 334006 (Rajasthan).

*** Associate Professor (Extension Education), Directorate of Extension Education, -Swami Keshwanand Rajasthan Agricultural University, Bikaner – 334006 (Rajasthan).

deviation of the adoption scores obtained by the respondents. The results of the same are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Distribution of beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries under different adoption categories

S. No.	Categories	Beneficiaries (n=150)	Non-beneficiaries (n=150)	Total (n=300)
1.	Low	32 (21.33)	73 (48.67)	105 (35.00)
2.	Medium	76 (50.67)	64 (42.67)	140 (46.67)
3.	High	42 (28.00)	13 (8.66)	55 (18.33)

Figures in parentheses are in percentage

The distribution of respondents given in Table 1 shows that maximum number of respondents (46.67%) were of medium adopter category followed by low (35.00%) and high (18.33%) adoption category.

It may be observed from Table 1 that nearly half of the beneficiary respondents were found to be medium adopter followed by 28.00 per cent respondents in high adoption categories. Only 21.33 per cent of the beneficiary respondents were found to be low adaptors of Home Science technologies. Similarly it may be seen from the data presented in Table 1 that 48.67 per cent and 42.67 per cent of non-beneficiary respondents were found to be low and medium adopters of Home Science technologies, respectively. Only few (8.66%) non-beneficiary respondents were found to as high adopters.

Hence it might be clear from the above findings that about 80 per cent of beneficiary respondents were found to be medium to high adopters whereas about 50 per cent non beneficiaries were found to be medium to high adopters.

The findings regarding Home Science technologies indicated that about 80 per cent of the beneficiary respondents were found to be medium to high adopters. It was due the fact that KVK training programmes helped in rapid transfer to technology and at the same time in acceptable manner to the respondents which might have resulted in increasing the adoption level of the beneficiary respondents. The beneficiaries were in direct contact of KVK personnel whereas the non-beneficiary respondents were getting benefit from other sources. This might have been the reason between the beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries in case of adoption level. The results are in conformity with Sharma and Sharma (2003).

Technology wise extent of adoption was worked out and presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Technology wise adoption level of respondents about Home science technologies

S. No.	Technologies	Beneficiaries (n=150)		Non-beneficiaries (n=150)		Total respondents (n=300)	
		MPS	Rank	MPS	Rank	MPS	Rank
1.	Nutrition Education	63.42	I	46.78	I	55.10	I
2.	Mother and childcare	57.52	II	42.65	II	50.08	II
3.	Health and Hygiene	55.73	III	41.51	III	48.62	III
4.	Grain storage	44.44	IV	33.40	IV	38.92	IV

Data presented in Table 2 explained that extent of adoption regarding Nutrition education was about 55.10 MPS and ranked first. Second and third rank was accorded to Mother and Childcare and Health and hygiene with 50.08 and 48.62 MPS, respectively. Grain storage technology ranked at the last position with MPS 38.92 only.

The data from the table further indicated that a similar trend for adoption of Home Science technologies was observed for beneficiary and non-beneficiary respondents. The extent of adoption about Nutrition education ranked first with 63.42 and 46.78 MPS, respectively for beneficiary and non- beneficiary respondents. Mother and Childcare was placed on second rank with 57.72 and 42.65 MPS, respectively for beneficiary and non-beneficiary respondents. Health & hygiene with 55.73 and 41.51 MPS respectively for beneficiary and non beneficiary respondents was placed on third rank. Less adoption of Grain storage

technology was observed (44.44 and 33.40 MPS) by beneficiary and non-beneficiary respondents.

To find out the variation or similarity in the adoption of beneficiary and non-beneficiary respondents about Home Science Technologies, 'Z' test was applied. The results are presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Comparison between adoption level of beneficiaries and non- beneficiaries.

S. No.	Categories	Mean Score	Variance	Calculated value of 'Z'
1.	Beneficiaries (n=150)	59.23	125.308	
2.	Non-Beneficiaries (n=150)	48.86	117.772	9.72**

** Significant at 1 per cent level of probability

Table 3 indicated that the computed value of 'Z' (9.72) was statistically significant at 1 per cent level of significance. Thus null hypothesis H02 was rejected which mean that the beneficiaries have adopted more Home Science technologies as compared to non-beneficiaries. There was a considerable gap between these two categories of respondents. This gap may be due to the KVK training programmes.

The results are in conformity with that of Singh (1996) and Asiwal (2006) who in their studies have reported a significant adoption difference in adoption between beneficiary and non-beneficiary farmers.

CONCLUSION

From the above discussion it could be concluded that about 46.6 per cent of total respondents had medium level of adoption while 35.00 and 18.33 per cent of the total respondents had low and high level of adoption respectively. Respondents category wise analysis indicated that 50.67 per cent of beneficiaries and 42.66 per cent of non beneficiaries had medium level of adoption while 48.66 and 21.33 per cent of non beneficiaries and beneficiaries had low level of adoption respectively, However, 28 per cent beneficiaries and 8.66 per cent non beneficiaries had high level of adoption.

REFERENCES

Asiwal, B.L. 2006. Impact of frontline demonstration on adoption of improved mustard production technology among the farmers of Laxmangarh panchayat samiti of Sikar district of Rajasthan. M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis submitted to RAU, Bikaner.

Sharma, R. and Sharma, S.K. 2003. Adoption of Improved Technology of Bajra Cultivation. Agriculture Extension Review, Jan-Feb. pp 27-29.

Singh, A.K. 1996. Impact of Krishi Vigyan Kendra in adoption of mustard production technology among the farmers of Nadbai panchayat samiti of Bharatpur district of Rajasthan. M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis submitted to RAU, Bikaner.

❑❑❑