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ABSTRACT

The Study was conducted in Pavagada taluk of Tumkur district based on highest area under Groundnut and implementation of seed village scheme. Three compact areas with 50 farmers from each, 40 farmers were randomly selected making a total sample of 120. Hundred per cent of farmers perceived as more useful about compact area approach to identify the areas/villages and training at different stages of crop for three days. Great majority of farmers perceived as useful on assistance for a period of two years (90.83%), followed by identification of new compact area after two years (84.17%), and farmers can take up programme independently after two years (81.67%). Majority of farmers perceived as less useful on assistance for seed storage bin (64.17%) and supply of seeds at 50 per cent of cost for half acre/farmer (55.83%). Out of nine characteristics considered, only six exhibited positive and significant relationship with their perception about usefulness of seed village scheme. It is inferred that seeds and seed storage bin need to be supplied at free of cost and also consider the personal characteristics of the farmer for effective implementation of the scheme.

INTRODUCTION

Seed is the most important and crucial agricultural input which holds the key for the farm productivity and profitability. Quality seeds can largely determine the success of modern farming as other inputs and management practices come into play after the germination and the establishment of the seedlings. Hence, the success of ‘Farm Front‘ can be largely counted upon the rapidity with which enough quantity of quality seeds of high yielding varieties are multiplied and made available to the farmers on time for sowing purposes (Venkatareddy, 1996).

Despite implementation of organized seed programme since mid 60’s the seed replacement rate has only reached the level of 15 per cent. Remaining 85 per cent of the seeds used are farm saved. To up grade the quality of farm saved seeds the seed village scheme was implemented. In Karnataka, groundnut is the premier oil seed crop grown in an area of 1.20 M.ha. with a production of 0.89MT. The availability of seeds during the sowing season is the major constraint. Therefore, this crop is included in the scheme. The effectiveness of such scheme for quality improvement of seed can only be seen in the eyes of farmers by considering how they are perceiving. Hence, to determine the status of pre-set seed village scheme in terms of its utility for the groundnut at the study was undertaken with following objectives.

1. To ascertain the perception of groundnut growers about usefulness of seed village scheme
2. To find out the relationship between characteristics of groundnut growers with their perception about usefulness of seed village scheme.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

The study was conducted in Tumkur district. Out of 10 taluks, Pavagada taluk was purposively selected based on highest area under groundnut. Hence, the seed village scheme was implemented by the University of Agricultural Sciences, Bangalore. In the taluk, three compact areas with 50 groundnut growers were purposively selected and from each 40 farmers was selected randomly making a total sample of 120. A scale developed by Sawant (2001) with slight modification was used for measuring in the perception of groundnut growers about usefulness.
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RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

It could be observed from Table 1 that 57.50 per cent farmers perceived seed village scheme as more useful, where as sizeable number of farmers (32.50%) perceived it as useful and negligible percent (10.00) of farmers had perceived less useful. The findings thus revealed that there is not much difficulty to achieve the desired perception and it needs some attention of the concerned authority to improve the prevailing situation. Sawant. (2001) were partially in agreement with the above findings.

The results presented in the Table 2 revealed that hundred per cent of groundnut growers perceived as more useful about compact area approach to identify the villages, one training at the time of sowing, second training during flower initiation stage and third training after harvest and at the time of processing. It indicates the farmers were relatively satisfied with these aspects. The possible reason for this finding was the growers were identified in compact area, training was given for three days at different crop stages which includes sowing to post harvest techniques.

Great majority of farmers perceived as useful an aspects viz., assistance for period of two years (90.83%), followed by identification of new compact area after two years (84.17%), farmers can take up programme independently after two years (81.67%) and monitoring by seed division (59.17%). The farmers might have felt that assistance for period of two years, identification of new compact areas after two years and monitoring by the seed division of the concerned department was useful. In addition, they might have felt that sufficient knowledge was acquired on quality seed production aspects by that time. Majority of farmers perceived as less useful on assistance for seed storage bin (64.17%) and supply of seeds at 50 per cent of farmers (32.50%) perceived it as useful and negligible percent (10.00) of farmers had perceived less useful. The findings thus revealed that there is not much difficulty to achieve the desired perception and it needs some attention of the concerned agency to improve the prevailing situation. Sawant. (2001) were partially in agreement with the above findings.

The results of the study revealed that hundred per cent of groundnut growers perceived as more useful about compact area approach to identify the villages, one training at the time of sowing, second training during flower initiation stage and third training after harvest and at the time of processing. It indicates the farmers were relatively satisfied with these aspects. The possible reason for this finding was the growers were identified in compact area, training was given for three days at different crop stages which includes sowing to post harvest techniques.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of perception</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less useful</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useful</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>32.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More useful</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>57.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Distribution of Groundnut growers according to their usefulness perception

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seed growers perception</th>
<th>More useful</th>
<th>Useful</th>
<th>Less useful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compact area to identify the Villages</td>
<td>120 100.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply of seeds at 50% cost for half an acre/farmer</td>
<td>11 9.17</td>
<td>42 35.00</td>
<td>67 55.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-33% assistance for seed storage bin</td>
<td>15 12.50</td>
<td>28 23.33</td>
<td>77 64.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance for a period of two years</td>
<td>109 90.83</td>
<td>11 9.17</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After two years farmers can take up the programme independently</td>
<td>98 81.67</td>
<td>22 18.33</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify the new compact area after two years</td>
<td>101 84.17</td>
<td>19 15.83</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring by the seed division</td>
<td>71 59.17</td>
<td>49 40.83</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training on seed—post harvest practices for three days at different crop stages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) At the time of sowing</td>
<td>120 100.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) During flowering stage</td>
<td>120 100.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) After harvest &amp; at the time of processing</td>
<td>120 100.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Perception of groundnut growers about usefulness of seed village scheme.
cost for half acre / farmer (55.83%) it could be
due to the fact that farmers felt that supply of
seed and seed storage bins should be at free of
cost. Because, the Government of Karnataka is
supplying seeds at 75 per cent subsidized rates
at the time of sowing.

It is seen from the Table. 2 that age,
farming experience and mass media exposure
were not significantly related with perception
about usefulness of seed village scheme. From
this it could be inferred that farmers belonging
to different age groups, different years of farming
experience and different levels of mass media
exposure perceived seed village scheme as equally
useful. This finding is in conformity with the
finding of Kale and Khupse (1982). Educational
status, landholding, social participation,
economic motivation, innovativeness and
decision making ability exhibited positive and
significant relationship with their perception
about usefulness of seed village scheme. The
farmer with higher educational status, larger size
of land holding, greater social participation,
economically motivated to earn more profits,
earliest in adoption of farm technology and higher
level of decision making ability perceived seed
village scheme as more useful than the other
farmers. Similar findings were also reported by
Balasubramanian and Perumal (1989), Dikle et

It could be concluded from the findings
of the study that the seed village scheme created
good opportunity for the groundnut growers to
improve the quality and quantity of groundnut
seed production. Further, for effective
implementation of the scheme the seeds and
seed storage bins should be supplied at free of
cost and the personal characteristics of the
farmers need to be considered.

### Table 3. Relationship between characteristics
of groundnut growers with their level of
usefulness perception

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Correlation coefficient (r)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational status</td>
<td>0.345**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land holding</td>
<td>0.316**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming experience</td>
<td>0.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social participation</td>
<td>0.352**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass media exposure</td>
<td>0.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic motivation</td>
<td>0.412**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovativeness</td>
<td>0.382**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision making ability</td>
<td>0.211*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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