

Original Research Article

<https://doi.org/10.20546/ijcmas.2020.908.145>

Impact Assessment of Horticulture Fair on Farming Community

B.S. Lakshmana Reddy^{1*}, Pushpa¹ and M.V. Srinivas Reddy²

¹Agricultural Extension, Department of Social and Allied Sciences, University of Horticultural Sciences Bagalkot, Karnataka, India

²Agricultural Extension, UAS, Bengaluru, Karnataka, India

*Corresponding author

ABSTRACT

Horticulture fair is an integrated extension approach to disseminate the technologies to its stakeholders and provides an opportunity to know about newly released technologies and ongoing research in the field. The present study was conducted during Totagarike Mela of University of Horticultural Sciences, Bagalkot. The data was collected from 500 participants using structured schedule. The results reveal that majority of the respondents are farmers (94.20%) belong to Bagalkot district (49.40%), participated only once (59.20%), illiterates (39.20%) and aged between 30 to 50 years (52.80%). The respondents obtained information about mela from Daily Newspaper (27.00%), Development Departments and Television (21.40% each) and Friends (20.40%). They participated to get technical information (63.80%) and to see indoor exhibition (28%) and implements and machineries (25.40%) while only 34.20% of them viewed all the stalls. About 47.40% of respondents visited indoor exhibition followed by agricultural machineries (45.60%), soil world (44.20%) and horticulture (38.20%). About 45.60% of the respondents received new information about agricultural machineries followed by soil world (32.80%), indoor exhibition (26.40%) and horticulture (22.60%) while only 56.20% of them visited demonstration plots and 28.60% participated in farmer to farmer interaction. Among 158 respondents who received useful and innovative technology/information, only 56.32% said they will adopt. Only 47.20% of participants said they will motivate others to participate in the Mela.

Keywords

Horticulture,
Farming
community,
Agricultural
machineries

Article Info

Accepted:
15 July 2020
Available Online:
10 August 2020

Introduction

Horticulture fair is an important event which plays a pivotal role in transfer of technologies to the stakeholders of agriculture, horticulture and related enterprises. It envisages a large scale display of improved horticultural technologies and farm inputs for the benefit of

farmers at one roof. It is an integrated extension approach consisting of all the extension teaching methods viz. individual, group as well as mass contact methods with appropriate audio visual aids. Owing to its powerfulness in changing the behaviour of farmers, this mega event is organized annually involving other line departments and

institutions to transfer the technologies to the intended clientele.

University of Horticultural Sciences (UHS), Bagalkot organized its fourth Totagarika Mela from 19-21st December, 2015 on a theme “*Healthy Soils for a Healthy Life*” providing a forum for interaction and throws light on development and opportunities in horticulture and allied sectors in the domestic and international arena especially on soil health, post harvest technology, seed processing, soil and water conservation practices, organic farming, green house technology and farm machinery. The main purpose of organizing Totagarikemela was to provide first hand information to farmers about the availability of modern technology useful to stakeholders and also to update about current ongoing research activities on various problems of farming. Nearly three lakh farmers from all the corners of the state and few from neighbouring state were participated. Around 450 horti-based companies and institutions participated in the mela to reach the end users. It is a great opportunity for the agripreneurs, developmental departments and non-governmental organizations and financial institutions to take part in this event.

At present, there has been increasing demand for organizing this type of Krishimelas and horti-fairs at various levels. with this background the present study was conducted with the following specific objectives to study the socio-personal characteristics of farmers participated in Totagarika Mela, to know the source of information to participate in mela, to understand the perception of farmers about usefulness of mela, to identify and designate the purpose for their participation and to document the suggestions of the farmers for the improvement for the conduct of melas in future. The findings on these aspects would help as to identify the strength and weakness of the event and also to tap the area that needs toning up and fine tuning preparations.

Materials and Methods

The present study was conducted during Totagarike Mela of University of Horticultural Sciences, Bagalkot organized for three days from 19th to 21st December, 2015. About 500 participants of Totagarike Mela were randomly contacted with the help of structured schedule for eliciting the information by personal interview method. The data was analyzed using frequency and percentage.

Results and Discussion

The findings of the present study have been summarized as below:

District wise participation of respondents

Table 1 depicts that nearly half of the participant respondents were come from the Bagalkot (49.40%) followed by Vijayapura (12.80%), Belgaum (7%), Bellary (6%), Dharwad (4%), Koppal (3.40%), Bidar (2.80%) and Chitradurga (2.0%). The participants from remaining districts namely UK, Karwar, Yadagiri, Raichur, Gadag, Haveri, Davanagere, Chikkaballpur, Shivamoga, Kalburgi, Bengaluru urban, Bengaluru rural, Mysuru and Kolar were less than two percent in each of these districts.

Frequency of participation of respondents

From the Table 2, we can conclude that around 60 per cent of the respondent farmers participated for the first time in the Totakarike Mela while 24 per cent of the respondents participated for the second time. Only 10 per cent of the respondents participated from three years but 6.80 per cent of the respondents participated in all the four Totagarike Mela's organized by UHS, Bagalkot.

Age of the respondents

From the table 3, we can opine that 27per cent of the respondents belong to age group of 41 to 50 years followed by 31 to 40 years age (25.80).

While, 17.20 per cent of the respondents were having age between 21 to 30years and 15.20 and 12.80 per cent of the respondents belong to age group of 51-60 & more than 60 years respectively. Only two per cent of respondents were below 20years of age.

Education

From the Table 4, we can depict the categorization of respondents based on education level, nearly 40 percent of the respondents were illiterates followed by high school (15.60%), graduate (14.40%), pre-university (13.00%) and higher primary (10.00%). While post graduates and primary school respondents were 5.20 and 2.60 per cent respectively.

Land holdings of the participants

Table 5 depicts that nearly 1/4th of the respondents were having 3to 4acres of land while 21per cent of them have 5 to 6 acres. Around 17.20per cent respondents have 7 to 8 acres, 14per cent have 1to 2 acres, 12.60per cent have 9 to 10 acres and 10.80per cent have 11 acres and above.

Occupation of the respondents

Table 6 depicts that majority of the respondents are agriculturists (94.20%) while only 1.80per cent respondents were businessmen and 4 per cent of them were employed in other jobs viz, public and private sector.

Subsidiary activities of the respondents

The analysis of subsidiary activities of the respondents reveals that 6.60per cent of the respondents practice agriculture as a subsidiary activity followed by dairy (4.80%) and business (1.40%). Less than one percent were working as a labour, practicing poultry, sheep rearing, consultancy, horticulture, piggery, tailor and lawyer (Table 7).

Type of cultivation

With regard to cultivation, 56.20per cent of the respondents are having irrigation facility while remaining 43.80per cent were practicing dryland farming (Table 8).

Source of information about Mela

With regard to source of information (Table 9), we can opine that just more than 1/4th of the respondents got information about Mela from daily newspaper (27.00%) followed by television and development departments (21.40 each) and friends (20.40%). While very less number of respondents got information from radio (4.80%), NGOs (3.60%) and only one percent got information from social media. About four per cent told that they got information other than the above said sources.

Facilitating Agency for the transportation of the respondents

Nearly 60 per cent of the respondents participated through their own means while development departments and University arranged the transportation for about 18.60per cent and 13.60per cent respondents respectively (Table 10). NGOs facilitated transportation for about 4.80per cent of the respondents while 2.60per cent respondents got transportation through friends, trusts, etc.

Purpose of participation

With regard to the purpose of participation, more than half of the respondents participated to get technical information (63.80%) followed by 28 per cent participation to see indoor exhibition, 25.40 per cent participated to see the implements and machineries while 21.20 per cent participated to see demonstration plots, 18 per cent discussed with the scientist and 10.20 per cent purchased the agricultural implements. About 4.80 participated without any of the purposes mentioned above while 12.60 per cent of the respondents participated for other purposes may be their friend, neighbours, colleagues might brought forcefully or for curiosity or to meet friends, etc. (Table 11).

Type of exhibits viewed by the respondents

Table 12 depicts that only 34.20 per cent respondent were able to view all the stalls while remaining have seen few important stalls necessary for them. About 47.40 per cent of respondents visited indoor exhibition followed by agricultural machineries (45.60%), soil world (44.20%), horticulture (38.20%), livestock (28.80%) and University stalls (24.40%). Less than 1/4th of the total respondents visited other stalls like development departments (17.60%), private companies (15%), research stations (12.80%), publication, consultancy cell and Agricultural implements (11.00% each). About 24.80 per cent of the respondents visited food stalls and other refreshments.

Respondents received new information from various stalls

The data reveals that no respondent received information from all the stalls in the Mela because there were too many stalls and cannot be exposed in a single day. About 45.60 per cent of the respondents received new

information about agricultural machineries followed by soil world (32.80%), indoor exhibition (26.40%), horticulture (22.60%), research demonstration (14.60%), livestock exhibition (12.80%) and food stalls (10.80%). Less than 1/10th of the respondents received new information from consultancy of scientists (9.20%) followed by private companies (7.60%), agricultural implements (7.40%), publication (5.80%), University stalls (5.00%), research stations (3.40%), development departments (3.20%) and field demonstrations (1.80%) (Table 13).

Inputs / Implements purchased by the respondents

From this table 14, we can conclude that only 10 per cent of the respondents purchased seeds followed by seedlings (8.20%), implements (6.80%), publications (5.00%) and fertilizers (4.40%). But 18.60 per cent of the respondents purchased other inputs like biofertilizers, insecticides or pesticides, etc.

Participants visited demonstration plots

Table 15 denotes that about 56.20 per cent of the respondents were visited demonstration plots whereas remaining 43.80 per cent of them didn't visited demonstration plots may be due to lack of time, lack of awareness, etc.

Demonstration plots visited by the participants

Table 16 data reveals that in fruit science division, majority of the respondents (58.20%) visited mango demonstration plots followed by pomegranate (26%), grapes (22.20%), Guava (16.80%), sapota (19.80%), custard apple (12.80%), citrus (8.20%), Amla (1.80%), Mosambi (1.60%), jack fruit (1.00%) and other plots (1.40%). In vegetable division, majority of the respondents visited drumstick (51.60%), onion (23.80%), field

bean (17.80%), pumpkin (8.40%) and others (2.80%). In floriculture division, majority of the respondents visited rose garden (57.0%) followed by Jasmine (16.80%), Gerbera (20.60%) and other flowers gardens (1.0%). In plantation, spices, medicinal and ornamental division, majority of the respondents visited coconut (39.60%) and only one per cent of the respondents visited other crops. Very few respondents visited agro forestry (1.80%), IFS unit (2.60%) and other divisions (0.80%)

Farmer's most interested division/part of the Mela

Table 17 depicts that nearly half of the respondents (49.80%) expressed their most interested division/part as indoor exhibition followed by consultancy cell (16.20%), demonstrations (11.60%), farmer to farmer interaction (11.60%), field visits (9.20%), stalls (8.60%), farmer award function (6.80%), input availability (5.80%) and other divisions (1.80%).

Three best stalls as perceived by the respondents

The responses of the respondents about their perception of three best stalls of totagarike mela were depicted in table 18. About 18.60per cent of the respondents have perceived floriculture as the best division/stall followed by agriculture implements/machineries (17.20%), vegetable division (16.40%) and fruit division (16.20%). Less than 1/10th of the farmers perceived Soil world (9.20%), Consultancy (6.80%), Livestock (6.20%), Out-door Exhibition (5.40%), Indoor exhibition (3.20%), Seed division (2.40%), Entomology (2.00%) and 1.60% of Dog show, Solar based machineries, Food stalls, Private institutes and NGO. About one per cent of the respondents perceived Post Harvest technology division as

the best followed by 0.80% each of the Medicinal and aromatic division, Social and allied sciences and Banana stalls. About 0.60% each of the respondents perceived Plant pathology division, Publication, Organic farming, KVK, Kolar and Rabbit rearing while only one person each perceived Research division, Natural Resource Management, Biofuel, Sheep & goat rearing, UAHS, Shivmogga and UAS, Bengaluru as the best division/stalls

Participation in farmer-farmer Interaction

Out of the total 500 respondents, only 143 respondents (28.60%) participated in farmer to farmer interaction while remaining 357 respondents (71.40%) didn't participate in farmer to farmer interaction (Table 19).

Respondents opinion about farmer-farmer Interaction

Out of the 143 respondents participated in the farmer to farmer interaction programmes, 39.16% of them expressed it is best while 41.96per cent told better followed by 18.18per cent as useful. Only one (0.70%) respondents opined useless about farmer-farmer Interaction (Table 20).

Opinion about the facilities provided to the respondents

The opinion of the respondents about the facilities provided to them is mentioned as below. With regard to the transportation facility, majority of them opined best (51.80%) followed by better (37.20%), normal (7.80%) and poor (3.20%).With respect to interaction with scientists, 44.60% of them expressed better followed by best (41.80%), normal (11.40%) and poor (2.00%).With regard to the publicity about the Mela, nearly half of them (50.20%) opined best followed by better (41.40%), normal

(6.60%) and poor (1.80%).The food arrangement was better as expressed by 48.0% respondents followed by best (29.0%), normal (18.6%) and poor (4.40%).

With respect to drinking water facility, majority of the respondents (49.20%) expressed better followed by best (31.60%), normal (14.40%) and poor (4.80%).The parking facility provided was best as opined by 46% respondents followed by better (45.80%), normal (7.0%) and poor (1.20%). Majority of them said that the toilet facility was better (53.20%) followed by best (32%), Normal (13%) and poor (1.80%). More than

half of the respondents (51.20%) expressed that accommodation was better followed by best (23.80%), normal (19.80%) and poor (5.20%) (Table 21).

Useful and innovative technology/ information as perceived by the respondents

Table 22 depicts that around 13.60per cent of the respondents perceived that technical information is very useful followed by machineries and implements (9.20%), solar machineries (5.00%), demonstrations (3.60%) and livestock (0.2%).

Table.1 District wise participation of respondents

Sl. No.	District	Number	Percent
1.	Bagalkot	247	49.40
2.	Vijayapur	64	12.80
3.	Belgaum	35	7.00
4.	Bellary	30	6.00
5.	Dharwad	20	4.00
6.	Koppal	17	3.40
7.	Bidar	14	2.80
8.	Chitradurga	10	2.00
9.	Uttar kannada	9	1.80
10.	Karwar	9	1.80
11.	Yadagiri	7	1.40
12.	Raichur	7	1.40
13.	Gadag	7	1.40
14.	Haveri	5	1.00
15.	Davanagere	4	0.80
16.	Chikkaballapur	3	0.60
17.	Shivamoga	3	0.60
18.	Kalburgi	3	0.60
19.	Bengaluru Urban	2	0.40
20.	Bengaluru rural	1	0.20
21.	Mysuru	1	0.20
22.	Kolar	2	0.40
	Total	500	100.00

Table.2 Distribution of respondents based on their frequency of participation

Sl. No.	Frequency	Number	Per cent
1.	Once	296	59.20
2.	Twice	120	24.00
3.	Thrice	50	10.00
4.	Four times	34	6.80
	Total	500	100.00

Table.3 Distribution of respondents based on age

Sl. No.	Age	Number	Per cent
1.	< 20	10	2.00
2.	21-30	86	17.20
3.	31-40	129	25.80
4.	41-50	135	27.00
5.	51-60	76	15.20
6.	>60	64	12.80
	Total	500	100.00

Table.4 Categorization of the respondents based on Education

Sl. No.	Education level	Number	Per cent
1.	Illiterate	196	39.20
2.	Primary school	13	2.60
3.	Higher primary	50	10.00
4.	High school	78	15.60
5.	Pre University	65	13.00
6.	Graduate	72	14.40
7.	Post graduate	26	5.20
	Total	500	100.00

Table.5 Distribution of respondents based on landholdings

Sl. No.	Land holdings (acres)	Number	Per cent
1.	1-2	70	14.00
2.	3-4	122	24.40
3.	5-6	105	21.00
4.	7-8	86	17.20
5.	9-10	63	12.60
6.	11 and above	54	10.80
	Total	500	100.00

Table.6 Main occupation of the respondents

Sl. No.	Occupation	Number	Per cent
1.	Agriculture	471	94.20
2.	Business	9	1.80
3.	Job	20	4.00
	Total	500	100.00

Table.7 Subsidiary activities of the respondents

Sl. No.	Activity	Number	Per cent
1.	Agriculture	33	6.60
2.	Dairy	24	4.80
3.	Business	7	1.40
4.	Labour	4	0.80
5.	Poultry	4	0.80
6.	Sheep rearing	3	0.60
7.	Consultancy	3	0.60
8.	Horticulture	1	0.20
9.	Piggery	1	0.20
10.	Tailor	1	0.20
11.	Lawyer	1	0.20

Table.8 Type of cultivation

Sl. No.	Type of cultivation	Number	Per cent
1.	Irrigated	281	56.20
2.	Dry land	219	43.80

Table.9 Source of information about Mela

Sl. No.	Source of information	Number	Per cent
1.	Daily Newspaper	135	27.00
2.	Television	107	21.40
3.	Development Departments	107	21.40
4.	Friends	102	20.40
5.	UHS	94	18.80
6.	Radio	24	4.80
7.	NGOs	18	3.60
8.	Social Media	5	1.00
9.	Others	20	4.00

Table.10 Facilitating agency for the transportation of the respondents

Sl. No.	Agency	Number	Per cent
1.	Own means	302	60.40
2.	Development departments	93	18.60
3.	University	68	13.60
4.	NGOs	24	4.80
5.	Others	13	2.60

Table.11 Purpose of participation

Sl. No.	Purpose	Number	Per cent
1.	To get Technical information	319	63.80
2.	To see Indoor exhibition	140	28.00
3.	To see implements and machineries	127	25.40
4.	To see demonstration plots	106	21.20
5.	To discuss with scientists	90	18.00
6.	To purchase agricultural implements	51	10.20
7.	None of the above	24	4.80
8.	Other	63	12.60

Table.12 Type of exhibits viewed by the respondents

Sl. No.	Exhibitions / stalls	Number	Per cent
1.	Indoor exhibitions	237	47.40
2.	Agricultural Machineries	228	45.60
3.	Soil world	221	44.20
4.	Horticulture	191	38.20
5.	Livestock	144	28.80
6.	Research demonstrations	143	28.60
7.	University stalls	122	24.40
8.	Development departments	88	17.60
9.	Private companies	75	15.00
10.	Research stations	64	12.80
11.	Publication	55	11.00
12.	Consultancy cell	55	11.00
13.	Agricultural implements	55	11.00
14.	Field demonstrations	38	7.60
15.	Food stalls	124	24.80
16.	All stalls	171	34.20

Table.13 Number of respondents received new information from various stalls

Sl. No.	Exhibitions / stalls	Number	Per cent
1.	Agricultural Machineries	228	45.60
2.	Soil world	164	32.80
3.	Indoor exhibitions	132	26.40
4.	Horticulture	113	22.60
5.	Research demonstrations	73	14.60
6.	Livestock exhibition	64	12.80
7.	Food stalls	54	10.80
8.	Consultancy cell	46	9.20
9.	Private companies	38	7.60
10.	Agricultural implements	37	7.40
11.	Publication	29	5.80
12.	University stalls	25	5.00
13.	Research stations	17	3.40
14.	Development departments	16	3.20
15.	Field demonstrations	9	1.80
16.	All stalls	0	0.00

Table.14 Inputs / Implements purchased by the respondents

Sl. No.	Inputs / Implements	Number	Per cent
1.	Seeds	50	10.00
2.	Seedlings	41	8.20
3.	Implements	34	6.80
4.	Publications	25	5.00
5.	Fertilizers	22	4.40
6.	Other inputs	93	18.60

Table.15 Number of participants visited demonstration plots

Sl. No.	Particulars	Number	Per cent
1.	Visited	281	56.20
2.	Not visited	219	43.80

Table.16 Details of demonstration plots visited by the participants

Sl. No.	Division	Crop	Number	Per cent
1.	Fruit science	Mango	291	58.20
		Pomegranate	130	26.00
		Grapes	111	22.20
		Guava	84	16.80
		Sapota	99	19.80
		Custard apple	64	12.80
		Citrus	41	8.20
		Amla	9	1.80
		Mosambi	8	1.60
		Jack fruit	5	1.00
		Others	7	1.40
2.	Vegetable	Drumstick	258	51.60
		Onion	119	23.80
		Field bean	89	17.80
		Pumpkin	42	8.40
		Others	14	2.80
3.	Floriculture	Rose	285	57.00
		Jasmine	84	16.80
		Gerbera	103	20.60
		Others	5	1.00
4.	Plantation, spices, medicinal and ornamental	Coconut	198	39.60
		Others	5	1.00
5.	Agro forestry		9	1.80
6.	IFS unit		13	2.60
7.	Other divisions		4	0.80

Table.17 Farmer's most interested division/part of the Mela

Sl. No.	Particulars	Number	Per cent
1.	Indoor exhibition	249	49.80
2.	Consultancy cell	81	16.20
3.	Demonstrations	58	11.60
4.	Farmer –farmer interaction	58	11.60
5.	Field visits	46	9.20
6.	Stalls	43	8.60
7.	Farmer award function	34	6.80
8.	Input availability	29	5.80
9.	Others	9	1.80

Table.18 Three best stalls as perceived by the respondents

Sl. No.	Division/stall	Number	Per cent
1.	Floriculture	93	18.60
2.	Agriculture implements / machineries	86	17.20
3.	Vegetable division	82	16.40
4.	Fruit division	81	16.20
5.	Soil world	46	9.20
6.	Consultancy	34	6.80
7.	Livestock	31	6.20
8.	Outdoor Exhibition	27	5.40
9.	Indoor exhibition	16	3.20
10.	Seed division	12	2.40
11.	Entomology	10	2.00
12.	Dog show	8	1.60
13.	Solar based machineries	8	1.60
14.	Food stalls	8	1.60
15.	Private institutes and NGO	8	1.60
16.	Post Harvest technology division	5	1.00
17.	Medicinal and aromatic division	4	0.80
18.	Social and allied sciences	4	0.80
19.	Banana stall	4	0.80
20.	Plant pathology division	3	0.60
21.	Publication	3	0.60
22.	Organic farming	3	0.60
23.	KVK, Kolar	3	0.60
24.	Rabbit rearing	3	0.60
25.	Research division	1	0.20
26.	Natural Resource Management	1	0.20
27.	Biofuel	1	0.20
28.	Sheep & goat rearing	1	0.20
29.	UAHS, Shivmogga	1	0.20
30.	UAS, Bengaluru	1	0.20

Table.19 Number of respondents participated in farmer-farmer Interaction

Sl. No.	Response	Number	Per cent
1.	Participated	143	28.60
2.	Not participated	357	71.40

Table.20 Opinion of the respondents about farmer-farmer Interaction

Sl. No.	Opinion	Number	Per cent
1.	Best	56	39.16
2.	Better	60	41.96
3.	Useful	26	18.18
4.	Useless	1	0.70

Table.21 Opinion about the facilities provided to the respondents

Sl. No.	Facilities	Best		Better		Normal		Poor	
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
1	Transport facility	259	51.80	186	37.20	39	7.80	16	3.20
2	Interaction with scientists	209	41.80	223	44.60	57	11.40	10	2.00
3	Publicity about the Mela	251	50.20	207	41.40	33	6.60	9	1.80
4	Food arrangements	145	29.00	240	48.00	93	18.60	22	4.40
5	Drinking water	158	31.60	246	49.20	72	14.40	24	4.80
6	Parking facility	230	46.00	229	45.80	35	7.00	6	1.20
7	Toilet facility	160	32.00	266	53.20	65	13.00	9	1.80
8	Accommodation	119	23.80	256	51.20	99	19.80	26	5.20

Table.22 Useful and innovative technology/information as perceived by the respondents

Sl. No.	Particulars	Number	Per cent
1.	Technical information	68	13.60
2.	Machineries and implements	46	9.20
3.	Solar machineries	25	5.00
4.	Demonstration	18	3.60
5.	Livestock	1	0.20

Table.23 Opinion about adoption of technology received in Mela

Sl. No.	Opinion	Number	Per cent
1.	Adopt	89	56.32
2.	Will not adopt/ not decided	69	43.68

Table.24 Overall perspective of the respondents about TotagarikaMela

Sl. No.	Opinion	Number	Per cent
1.	Best	246	49.20
2.	Better	191	38.20
3.	Normal	62	12.40
4.	Poor	1	0.20

Table.25 Suggestions for the improvement of Totagarike Mela

Sl. No.	Suggestions	Number	Per cent
1.	Improvement in Food arrangements	38	7.60
2.	Improvement in Drinking Water facility	21	4.20
3.	Consultancy	21	4.20
4.	Free and more transportation facility	18	3.60
5.	More publicity	18	3.60
6.	Improvement and increase in demonstration plots	13	2.60
7.	Free and good Accommodation facility	9	1.80
8.	Cleanliness	4	0.80
9.	Toilet facility	4	0.80
10.	Early publicity of experts and progressive farmers participants	1	0.20
11.	Importance to livestock exhibition	1	0.20
12.	Increase in post harvest technology stalls	1	0.20
13.	More Seedlings availability	1	0.20

Table.26 Motivation of Respondents to others to participate in Mela

Sl. No.	Particular	Numbers	Per cent
1.	Motivated	236	47.20
2.	Not motivated	274	54.80

Opinion about adoption of technology received in Mela

Out of 158 respondents who received useful and innovative technology/information as perceived by them, only 56.32 per cent will adopt while remaining 43.68 per cent were not decided to adopt or may not adopt (Table 23).

Overall perspective of the respondents about Totagarika Mela

We learnt from the table 24 that nearly half of the respondents (49.20%) opined that the totagarike mela was best followed by better (38.20%) and normal (12.40%). While only one person said the mela was poor which might be due to his higher expectations.

Suggestions for the improvement of Totagarike Mela

In order to improve the Totagarike Mela in future, Respondent participants suggested to improve food arrangements (7.60%), drinking water facility and consultancy (4.20% each), free and more transport facility and more publicity (3.60% each), improvement and increase in demonstration plots (2.60%), free and good accommodation facility (1.80%). While less than one per cent of the respondents suggested to improve cleanliness, toilet facility, early publicity of experts and progressive farmers participants, livestock exhibition, increase post harvest technology display stalls and more seedlings availability (Table 25).

Number of Respondents motivated others to participate in Mela

About 47.20 per cent of the respondent participants motivated friends, neighbours, relatives, etc to participate in the Mela while remaining didn't motivate any other (Table 26).

It could be concluded from this study that majority of respondent were from Bagalkot district, middle aged, illiterates with small land holding and agriculture was their major occupation. Majority of them obtained information about mela from newspaper followed by TV, line departments and friends and other sources. Good majority of farmers perceived that, new information was received agriculture machineries, soil health management, horticulture crops, etc.

Among different divisions, most of the participants rated floriculture, machineries, vegetable and fruit division as the best where as majority of them didn't participated in farmer to farmer interaction which needs attention. Overall half of the respondents opined the totagarike mela as the best. The major suggestions expressed by the respondents were improvement in food and drinking water facility for future.

References

- Gangadharappa, N.R. and Jayaramaiah, K.M., 1985, A critical analysis of Krishimela. *Curr. Res.*, 14 (1-3): 19:20.
- Manjula, N. and M. K. Sheikh, 2010, Impact of Krishimela on participating farmers Agriculture Update, Vol. 5 (1&2) 54-58.& 2| 54-58 |*Agriculture Update / February & May 2010 | Vol. 5 MM | Issue 1 & 2| 54-58.*
- Manjula, N., Gowda, G.V., Shashikumar, S. and Kumari Roopa G., 2002, Perception of farm women about KrishiMela held at University of Agriculture Sciences, Bangalore. *Land Bank J.*, Pp. 13-19.
- Narayanaswamy, B., Ramakrishna, Naika, Nataraj, M.S. and Narayanagowda K. 2005, Opinion of farmers on Krishimela and their suggestions.
- Rao, M.K., Venkataramaiah, P. and Hanchinal, S.N. 1996, An appraisal of field day programme 1974-75 by the participants conducted at College of Agriculture, Dharwad, *Curr. Res.*, 5: 2-4
- Swamy, S.B., Jahagirdar, K. A. and Sontakki, B.S. 1992, Characteristics of participants of Krishimela, *Maharashtra J.Extn. Edu.*, 11: 319-323.

How to cite this article:

Lakshmana Reddy, B.S., Pushpa and Srinivas Reddy, M.V. 2020. Impact Assessment of Horticulture Fair on Farming Community. *Int.J.Curr.Microbiol.App.Sci.* 9(08): 1282-1296. doi: <https://doi.org/10.20546/ijcmas.2020.908.145>