

## Role Performance and Relationship between the Selected Characteristics of the Respondents towards Farm School of Agricultural Technology Management Agency (ATMA).

Surender Kumar \* Syed H. Mazher\*\* Dipak Kumar Bose\*\*\*

---

**Abstract:** Farm school serve as a mechanism for farmer to farmer extension at every block or tehsil. Role performance of the respondents towards ATMA has shown its prescribed role and their relative success or failure. A study was undertaken to know role performance and relationship between the selected characteristics and role performance towards farm school. The study was conducted in eight farm schools of Sri Ganganagar District of Rajasthan with a sample of 160 farmers working on farm school. The findings inferred that majority (68.75%) of the respondents of Farm School fall in the category of moderate performance of role followed by 25.00 and 06.25 per cent of them fall in the poor and good role performance categories respectively. The result clearly indicates that the farmers were highly influenced by the farm school of ATMA project running in their area.

**Key words:** Role performance, relationship, characteristics, Technology, Management.

---

### I. INTRODUCTION

Agricultural Technology Management Agency (ATMA) is a registered society responsible for technology dissemination at the district level having linkages with all the line departments, research organizations, non-governmental organizations and agencies associated with agricultural development in the district. Extension Reforms in India were pilot tested in 28 Districts of 7 States under Innovations in Technology Dissemination (ITD) component of World Bank funded NATP during the period from November, 1998 to April, 2005. This successful experiment served as a basis to launch the Scheme “Support to State later up-scaled to 252 districts during the 10<sup>th</sup> Plan. The scheme was implemented in 11 districts in 2006-07, 10 districts in 2007-08 and one district in 2009-10 (Chouhan *et al* 2014). In Sri Ganganagar district of Rajasthan it was started in the year 2006-07.

The National Commission on Farmers has recommended the Farm School concept and to be organized in the field of outstanding/progressive/ awardees farmer. Farm school provide the vital link between the progressive/achiever & others in a village. These farmers would normally be the ones who have been accepted by others farmers as achiever farmers for their success, and adoption of technologies, yield, difference, income raised in agriculture and other allied sector. One of the main activities of farm school is operationalize front line demonstration in one or more crop and/or allied sector (D. Bortamuly and B.L. Khuhly 2013)

Farm school is informal form of school at field level where the host farmer act as teacher who coordinate and communicate to the member about the successful practices. The success of farm school of any activity is mainly depends upon actual performance of its member. In view of the above present investigation aims to study the role performance and relationship between socio-economic characteristics of the farmers towards farm school of ATMA.

### II. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The present investigation was purposely conducted in two Tehsil viz; Raisinghnagar and Anupgarh of Sri Ganganagar district of Rajasthan. An descriptive research design was adopted to conduct the study. Out of all organized Farm School in four Farm School from each was randomly selected. Out of these 160 farmers were selected with the help of proportionate random sampling method.

---

\*Ex-M.Sc (Ag.) Extension student. SHIATS, Allahabad, U.P.

\*\* & \*\*\* Associate Professor, Department of Agricultural Extension and Communication, SHIATS, Allahabad, U.P.

**Table -1 Information about variables:**

| <b>1.Socio economic characteristics</b> |                                    |                      |       |
|---|------------------------------------|----------------------|-------|
| <b>1.1. Age</b>                         |                                    |                      |       |
| Sr.                                     | Groups                             | Categories           | Score |
| 1.                                      | Young age                          | Up to 36 years       | 1     |
| 2.                                      | Middle age                         | 37 to 50 years       | 2     |
| 3.                                      | Old age                            | Above 50 years       | 3     |
| <b>1.2. Education</b>                   |                                    |                      |       |
| 1                                       | Illiterate                         |                      | 1     |
| 2                                       | Primary                            |                      | 2     |
| 3                                       | High school                        |                      | 3     |
| 4                                       | Intermediate                       |                      | 4     |
| 5                                       | Graduate and above level           |                      | 5     |
| <b>1.3.Occupation</b>                   |                                    |                      |       |
| 1.                                      | Farming                            |                      | 1     |
| 2.                                      | Farming + Live stock               |                      | 2     |
| 3.                                      | Farming + Animal + Service         |                      | 3     |
| <b>1.4.Annual income</b>                |                                    |                      |       |
| 1.                                      | Low annual income                  | Up to 50,000/-       | 1     |
| 2.                                      | Medium annual income               | 50,001 to 1,00,000/- | 2     |
| 3                                       | High annual income                 | Up to 100000         | 3     |
| <b>1.5.Land holding</b>                 |                                    |                      |       |
| 1.                                      | Marginal                           | Up to 1 ha           | 1     |
| 2.                                      | Small                              | 1-2 ha               | 2     |
| 3.                                      | Medium                             | 2-6 ha               | 3     |
| <b>1.6.Farming experience</b>           |                                    |                      |       |
| 1.                                      | Lower level of farming experience  | Up to 10 years       | 1     |
| 2.                                      | Medium level of farming experience | 10 to 20 years       | 2     |
| 3.                                      | High level of farming Experience   | Up to 30 years       | 3     |
| <b>2.Role performance</b>               |                                    |                      |       |
| 1.                                      | Poor performance                   | Mean below 1.6       | 1     |
| 2.                                      | Moderate performance               | Mean from 1.6 to 3.2 | 2     |
| 3.                                      | Good performance                   | Mean above 3.2       | 3     |

**Measurement of role performance:**

To know role performance towards farm school of the respondents a structured schedule was developed The scoring procedure for individual positive items in the role performance scale was strongly agree (4), Agree (3), Undecided (2), Disagree (1), strongly disagree (0).The scoring procedure was just reversed for the negative items i.e. 0, 1, 2, 3 and 4. The statistical tools used were percentage, mean score, standard deviation and coefficient of correlation.

**III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

**Table-2 Socio-economic characteristics of the respondents:**

(N=160)

| <b>Age</b>       |                       |            |               |
|------------------|-----------------------|------------|---------------|
| Sr.              | Groups                | Frequency  | Percentage    |
| 1                | Young age ( up to 36) | 80         | 50.00         |
| 2                | Middle age (37 to 50) | 68         | 42.50         |
| 3                | Old age (above 50)    | 12         | 07.50         |
| <b>Total</b>     |                       | <b>160</b> | <b>100.00</b> |
| <b>Education</b> |                       |            |               |
| 1                | Illiterate            | 28         | 17.50         |
| 2                | Primary               | 38         | 23.75         |
| 3                | High school           | 44         | 27.50         |

|                           |                                    |            |               |
|---------------------------|------------------------------------|------------|---------------|
| 4                         | Intermediate                       | 36         | 22.50         |
| 5                         | Graduate and above level           | 14         | 08.75         |
| <b>Total</b>              |                                    | <b>160</b> | <b>100.00</b> |
| <b>Occupation</b>         |                                    |            |               |
| 1                         | Farming                            | 32         | 20.00         |
| 2                         | Farming + Live stock               | 120        | 75.00         |
| 3                         | Farming + Live stock + Service     | 08         | 05.00         |
| <b>Total</b>              |                                    | <b>160</b> | <b>100.00</b> |
| <b>Annual Income</b>      |                                    |            |               |
| 1                         | Up to Rs. 50,000                   | 56         | 35.00         |
| 2                         | Rs. 50,001 to Rs. 1,00,000         | 86         | 53.75         |
| 3                         | Above Rs. 1,00,001                 | 18         | 11.25         |
| <b>Total</b>              |                                    | <b>160</b> | <b>100.00</b> |
| <b>Land Holding</b>       |                                    |            |               |
| 1.                        | Marginal (up to 1 ha)              | 40         | 25.00         |
| 2.                        | Small (1-2 ha)                     | 55         | 34.36         |
| 3.                        | Medium (2-6 ha)                    | 46         | 28.75         |
| 4.                        | Big ( above 6 ha)                  | 19         | 11.87         |
| <b>Total</b>              |                                    | <b>160</b> | <b>100.00</b> |
| <b>Farming Experience</b> |                                    |            |               |
| 1                         | Lower level of farming experience  | 28         | 17.50         |
| 2                         | Medium level of farming experience | 80         | 50.00         |
| 3                         | Higher level of farming experience | 52         | 32.50         |
| <b>Total</b>              |                                    | <b>160</b> | <b>100.00</b> |

**Age-** It is clear from the Table-2 that majority of the respondents (92.50 %) were in young to middle age groups. Thus, it indicates that these groups considered as actively working age and being a responsible one for supporting to their expected role performance.

**Education-** The Table-2 inferred that majority of the respondents (82.50 per cent) were educated. This may be due to availability of the primary and secondary schools at village level and colleges at Tehsil levels.

**Occupation-** The Table-2 also indicated that almost all (95.00 %) of the respondents had occupation of farming + Live stock and farming. The probable reason may be that the Farm School respondents have considered these two as an important one which may restrict them to go for any other supplementary income.

**Annual Income** -The data presented in Table-2 indicated that majority (53.75 %) of the respondent of Farm School were having annual income higher than Rs. 50000. This might be due to live stock was subsidiary occupation.

**Land holding-** The data shows in Table-2 shows that majority (63.11 %) of the respondents possessed small size to medium size of land holding. The possible reason of this finding might be due to inherited deviation of land from generation to generation. Similar finding is also reported by **Geeta et al (2001)**, **Mankar et al (2006)**

**Role Performance** -The respondents were classified into three categories i.e. Poor performance, Moderate performance and Good performance on the basis of calculated mean and standard deviation of the role performance score obtained by them.

**Table-3: Role performance level of the respondents towards farm school: (N=160)**

| Sr.          | Level of role performance                      | Percentage    |
|--------------|--|---------------|
| 1            | Poor performance<br>(mean below 1.6)           | 25.00         |
| 2            | Moderate performance<br>(mean from 1.6 to 3.2) | 68.75         |
| 3            | Good performance<br>(mean above 3.2)           | 06.25         |
| <b>Total</b> |  | <b>100.00</b> |

The table 3 indicated that majority of the respondents (68.75%) fall in the category of moderate performance of role followed by 25.00 and 06.25 per cent of them fall in the poor and good role performance categories respectively. The probable reason may be due to that the majority of respondents were from middle to young age groups and also possessed medium to high level of farming experience. Moreover, the activities carried under ATMA were in need and interest of members and hence their role performance under this project was seems to be on large extend. The finding is in the line of the finding **Hingonekar, S.S. (2011), Chayal and Dhaka (2010)**

**Relationship between the selected characteristics and role performance:**

The variables like age, education, occupation, annual income, land holding, and farming experience, were taken as selected characteristics of respondents to ascertain the association with their role performance in Farm School. For that the correlation of coefficient “r” was calculated. The findings are presented in the Table 3.

**Table-3: Relationship between selected characteristics of the respondents and their role performance (N=160)**

| Sr. | Personal profile   | Correlation coefficient (r) |
|-----|--------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1   | Age                | -0.14794 <sup>NS</sup>      |
| 2   | Education          | 0.198309*                   |
| 3   | Occupation         | 0.286289**                  |
| 4   | Annual Income      | 0.434125**                  |
| 5   | Land holding       | 0.24263*                    |
| 6   | Farming experience | 0.326825**                  |

\* Significant at 5% (0.196) \*\* Significant at 1% (0.256) NS Non significant

It is clear from the above Table that the age (-0.14794<sup>NS</sup>) was negatively and non-significantly correlated with role performance of Farm School respondents working under ATMA project. However, the education (0.198309\*) and land holding (0.24263\*) was positively and significantly correlated with role performance of Farm School respondents, Where as occupation (0.286289\*\*), annual income (0.434125\*\*), and Farming experience (0.326825\*\*) were highly positively and significantly correlated with role performance of Farm School respondents. The report in the line of the finding of **Hingonekar (2011), Deshpande et al (2013)**

These associations inferred that the education, occupation, annual income and land holding, plays significant role in performance of ATMA respondents. The probable reason for this might be that the respondents were perceived the importance of ATMA project in context to their nature and resources available with them.

**References**

[1] **A.R. Deshpande, Soni, and Shekhawat (2013)**. Role Performance of Gram Panchayat Members in Agricultural Development Programmes *Indian Res. J. Ext. Edu.* 13 (2), 89-91.

[2] **Bortamuly, D and Khuhly (2013)**. Constraints faced by Block Level Extension Functionaries in facilitating Commodity Interest Groups and Farm Schools under ATMA in NE Indian states. *Journal of Academia and Industrial Research (JAIR)* Vol. 2 and 291-294.

[3] **Chouhan, Henry and Sharma (2014)**. Attitude of farmers towards ATMA. *Ind. J. Extn. Educ. & R.D.* 22 : 48-50, 2014

[4] **Geeta, G. S.; Srinivasa, G.; Jayaram, H.; Iyengar, M. N. S. and Vijayaprakash, N. B. (2001)**. Socio-economic determinates of farmer oriented technology packages for sericulture: A Field study. *Indian J. Seric.*, 40 (1) : 96-99.

[5] **Hingonekar, S.S. (2011)**. Role perception and role performance of FIGs working under ‘ATMA’ project at Tapi and Valsad districts of South Gujarat. M. Sc. (Agri.) thesis, NAU, Navsari.

[6] **Mankar, D. M.; Singh, M. and Nirbhan, A. J. (2006)**. Socio-economic attributes of mango growers in relation to adoption of Paclbutrazol technology. *Souvenir and Abstracts.*, pp:35.