Personal co-relates of sprinkler irrigation technology

VIDYA V. TAYDE, P.S. SHINDE AND P.S. KAPSE

ABSTRACT

See end of the article for authors' affiliations

Correspondence to : VIDYA V. TANDE Department of Extension Education, L.D.P. College of Agriculture, Dahegaon, AURANGABAD (M.S.) INDIA

district of Maharashtra State. A sample of 100 respondents was drawn randomly with an object to study the Presonal ,Socio-economic,Communicational and Psychological Characterstice of beneficiaries and to study the relationship between personal personal characteristics with evaluation of sprinkler Irrigation Scheme.Data were collected by personally interviewing the respondents and analyzed stastically. The findings revealed that majority of respondent were middle age group, mostly matriculate, possessed land between 4.01 to 10ha.belonged moderately deep category of soil with an annual income between Rs. 1,00,001 to Rs. 2,00,001. Majority of beneficiaries had medium level of social participation, middle level of socio-economic status, medium access to source of information and medium level of innovativeness. The education, land holding ,annual income, social participation, socioeconomic status, sources of information and innovativeness were found to be positively significantly correlated with change in cropping pattern, production and productivity, income, employment generation, occupation material possession. Multiple regression analysis showed that all the independent variables together accounted for 18.68, 26.17,21.74,22.68,15.76 and 11.79 in respect of change in cropping pattern, production and productivity, income, employment generation, and material possession. It was found to be significant in all the dependent variables except change in occupation. None of the variables was found to be significantly affecting the change in material possession and employment generation, area under sprinkler irrigation was found to be significant determinant of evaluation.

The Present study was conducted in eighteen Villages in Akot and Telhara Panchyat samiti in Akola

INTRODUCTION

The prime importance is given for agricultural development involving land and water management in relation to improved crop production keeping in view the need of resources conservation, development and utilization for higher productivity and profitability. Maharashtra Government implemented the sprinkler irrigation scheme. Keeping this in view, the present investigation was carried out with specific objective to study the Personal, Socio-economic communicational psychological characteristics of and beneficiaries and to study the relationship between personal characteristics with evaluation of sprinkler irrigation scheme.

METHODOLOGY

The study was conducted in Akola district of Maharashtra state. Out of seven panchayat samities, two panchayat samities, namely Akot and Telhara were selected purposively on the basis of maximum beneficiaries. A sample of 100 beneficiaries was drawn randomly. The experimental design of social research was used to assess the evaluation (impact) of scheme on farmer beneficiaries. The data were

collected from them in the structured interview schedule by the researchers.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A perusal of Table 1 revealed that majority of the respondents (56.00%) were middle age, followed by 42.00% in the secondary level of education. Nearly three-fourth of respondent (74.00%) were medium farmer possessing the land between 4.01to 10 ha. Over half of the respondent (57.00%) had moderately deep category of land. Nearly two-third of the beneficiaries (64.00%) had an area above 2ha. Under sprinkler irrigation. Nearly half of the respondent (47.00%) had annual income between Rs. 1,00,001 to 2,00,000/. An overwhelming majority of the beneficiaries (90.00%) were found to be with medium social Participation with a membership in formal social organization. Nearly three-fourth of the beneficiaries (72.0%) were found to have moderate level Socio-economic status in the village community. Three-fourth (75.00%) of the beneficiaries had an access to the different sources of information about sprinkler irrigation scheme to a moderate extent. Over half of the respondents (57.00%) beyond to the medium level of innovations, followed by 23 per cent in

Key words : Personal

characteristics, sprinkler irrigation technology, correlation

Accepted : January, 2010

Sr. No.CategoryFrequency/Percentage (n=100)Age1.Young22.002.Middle56.003.Old22.00Education1.Illiterate00.002.Primary School07.003.Middle School15.004.Secondary School42.005.Higher Secondary School18.006.College18.001.Marginal farmer00.002.Small farmer00.003.Semi medium farmer23.00
No.Category(n=100)Age1.Young22.002.Middle56.003.Old22.00Education22.001.Illiterate00.002.Primary School07.003.Middle School15.004.Secondary School42.005.Higher Secondary School18.006.College18.001.Marginal farmer00.002.Small farmer00.003.Semi medium farmer23.00
Age1.Young22.002.Middle56.003.Old22.00Education22.001.Illiterate00.002.Primary School07.003.Middle School15.004.Secondary School42.005.Higher Secondary School18.006.College18.001.Marginal farmer00.002.Small farmer00.003.Semi medium farmer23.00
1.Young22.002.Middle56.003.Old22.00Education22.001.Illiterate00.002.Primary School07.003.Middle School15.004.Secondary School42.005.Higher Secondary School18.006.College18.001.Marginal farmer00.002.Small farmer00.003.Semi medium farmer23.00
2.Middle56.003.Old22.00Education11.Illiterate00.002.Primary School07.003.Middle School15.004.Secondary School42.005.Higher Secondary School18.006.College18.00Land holding11.Marginal farmer00.002.Small farmer00.003.Semi medium farmer23.00
3.Old22.00EducationEducation1.Illiterate00.002.Primary School07.003.Middle School15.004.Secondary School42.005.Higher Secondary School18.006.College18.001.Marginal farmer00.002.Small farmer00.003.Semi medium farmer23.00
Education1.Illiterate00.002.Primary School07.003.Middle School15.004.Secondary School42.005.Higher Secondary School18.006.College18.00Land holding11.Marginal farmer00.002.Small farmer00.003.Semi medium farmer23.00
1.Illiterate00.002.Primary School07.003.Middle School15.004.Secondary School42.005.Higher Secondary School18.006.College18.00Land holding11.Marginal farmer00.002.Small farmer00.003.Semi medium farmer23.00
2.Primary School07.003.Middle School15.004.Secondary School42.005.Higher Secondary School18.006.College18.00Land holding11.Marginal farmer00.002.Small farmer00.003.Semi medium farmer23.00
3.Middle School15.004.Secondary School42.005.Higher Secondary School18.006.College18.00Land holding11.Marginal farmer00.002.Small farmer00.003.Semi medium farmer23.00
 4. Secondary School 42.00 5. Higher Secondary School 18.00 6. College 18.00 Land holding 1. Marginal farmer 00.00 2. Small farmer 00.00 3. Semi medium farmer 23.00
 Higher Secondary School College Land holding Marginal farmer Small farmer Semi medium farmer 23.00
6.College Land holding18.001.Marginal farmer00.002.Small farmer00.003.Semi medium farmer23.00
Land holding1.Marginal farmer00.002.Small farmer00.003.Semi medium farmer23.00
1.Marginal farmer00.002.Small farmer00.003.Semi medium farmer23.00
2.Small farmer00.003.Semi medium farmer23.00
3. Semi medium farmer 23.00
4. Medium farmer 74.00
5. Big farmer 03.00
Type of soil
1. Very shallow 00.00
2. Shallow 00.00
3. Moderately deep 57.00
4. Deep 41.00
5. Very deep 02.00
Area under sprinkler irrigation
1. Low 00.00
2. Medium 36.00
3. High 64.00
Annual income
1. Upto Rs.1.00.000/ 10.00
2. 1.00.000 to 2.00.000 47.00
3. 2.00.001 to 3.00.000 27.00
4. Above 3.00.000 16.00
Social participation
1. Low 00.00
2. Medium 90.00
3. High 10.00
Socio-economic status
1. Lower SES 00.00
2. Lower middle SES 04.00
3 Middle SFS 72.00
4 Upper middle SES 24.00
5 Upper SES 00.00
Source of information
1 Low 14.00
2 Medium 75.00
3 High 11.00
Innovativeness
$1 \qquad \text{Low} \qquad \qquad 12.00$
1. Low 12.00 2 Medium 56.00
3. High 32.00

high level of innovativeness.

Relational analysis:

The findout the relationship between Personal characteristics of the beneficiaries and evaluation of Sprinkler Irrigation Technology correlation coefficient were worked out and are presented in Table 2.

The characteristic of the respondent such as education, land holding, area under sprinkler irrigation scheme, annual income, Social participation, Socioeconomic status, source of information and innovativeness had positive and significant correlation with change in their dependent variables as shown in Table 2. In evaluation, age, type of soil, and social participation does not affect socio-economic development of farmers while education, land holding, area under sprinkler irrigation and source of information have good contribution in development of socio-economic status of farmers. These findings are corroborative to the findings of Rao (1986) and Ingle (2002).

It is revealed from Table 3 that the regression coefficient (R^2) indicates that ten variables contributed 0.2617, 0.2268 and 0.2178 per cent the maximum variation towards change in production, change in income and change in productivity are, respectively. These findings are in conformity with the findings of Rao (1986).

Conclusion:

The sprinkler irrigation scheme definitely benefited the farmers both in improving the socio-economic status and helped in increasing irrigation potential in the area. A substantial change occur on beneficiaries in terms changes in cropping pattern their production and productivity, Income, Material Possession and Employmentgeneration.

Table 2 : Relationship between independent and dependent variable								
C.,	· ·	Change in						
No.	Variables	Cropping pattern	Production	Productivity	Income	Employment- generation	Material possession	
1.	Age	0.014	0.230^{*}	0.078	0.079	0.005	0.061	
2.	Education	0.311**	0.260^{*}	0.329**	0.265^{**}	0.033	0.047	
3.	Land holding	0.326**	0.235^{*}	0.061	0.208^{*}	0.200^{*}	0.177	
4.	Type of soil	0.152	0.140	0.015	0.078	0.115	0.096	
5.	Area under sprinkler irrigation	0.201^{*}	0.377^{**}	0.195^{*}	0.315**	0.240^{**}	0.060	
6.	Annual income	0.220^{*}	0.073	0.207^{**}	0.228^{**}	0.017	0.194^{*}	
7.	Social participation	0.120	0.096	0.003	0.088	0.211^*	0.194^{*}	
8.	Socio-economic status	0.067	0.026	0.022	0.234^{**}	0.107	0.196^{*}	
9.	Sources of information	0.228^{**}	0.197^*	0.230^{**}	0.227^{**}	0.059	0.109	
10.	Innovativeness	0.213*	0.229*	0.138	0.196*	0.197*	0.037	

* and ** indicate significance of values at P=0.05 and 0.01, respectively

Table 3 : Multiple regression analysis							
Sr. No.	Evaluation	R^2					
1.	Change of cropping pattern	0.1868					
2.	Change of production	0.2617					
3.	Change of productivity	0.2178					
4.	Change of income	0.2268					
5.	Change of employment generation	0.1576					
6.	Change of material possession	0.1179					

REFERENCES

Ingle, G.S. (2002). Impact of lift irrigation project on beneficiaries. M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis Dr. Panjabrao Deshmukh Krishi Vidyapeeth, Akola (M.S.).

Muley, R. (1996). Government Different Schemes for Farmers. *Adarsha Shetkari Udyog*, **1**(3):22.

Rao and Ali (1986). Impact of irrigation on cropping pattern. *Kurukshestra*, **34**(11):37.

Authors' affiliations

P.S. SHINDE, Department of Extension Education, Dr. Panjabrao Deshmukh Krishi Vidyapeeth, AKOLA (M.S.) INDIA

P.S. KAPSE, Department of Extension Education, Rajeev Gandhi College of Agriculture, PARBHANI (M.S.) INDIA

******** *****