

## Original Research Article

# Perception of Farmers about Usefulness of University Kisan Mela

M. N. Ansari\* and A. K. Paswan

Department of Extension Education, Tirhut College of Agriculture, Dholi,  
RPCAU, Pusa, Bihar, India

*\*Corresponding author*

## ABSTRACT

The study was undertaken to know the perception of farmers about usefulness of university KisanMela. The study was conducted at Rajendra Agricultural University, Bihar where KisanMela was organized for three days from 5-7<sup>th</sup> March, 2016, involving 120 randomly selected participating farmers. The findings indicated that maximum numbers of participants were middle age group, had matriculation level of education, belong to OBC category, untrained with small land holding and agriculture and subsidiary was major occupation. Good majority of participating farmers perceived that information received at KisanMela on Agricultural implements & machine, IFS, Dairy & AH, Mushroom Cultivation and Medicinal & Herbal planting were more useful. Therefore, special emphasis was given on selected dimension by policy makers and planners while organising the KisanMela.

### Keywords

Perception, Kisan  
Mela, Farmers

## Introduction

KisanMela is an important mass contact method in extension teaching. It is an organized educational activity for involving and educating farmers by bringing together the farmers, scientists, extension workers, input agencies, developmental departments and non-governmental agencies on agriculture or allied aspects at a Research Station or an agriculturally important educational centre, where the farmers can see, interact and gain first hand knowledge about the latest technologies and developments in agriculture and allied aspects. It integrates several educational activities specifically directed to the farmers

of a region, state or country. At present there has been increasing demand for organising such KisanMela at different levels. Hence, it is appropriate to study the perception of farmers about usefulness of university KisanMela. The findings on these aspects would act as guideline to identify the strength and weakness of the programme and also to help in tapping the area that need toning up.

## Materials and Methods

The study was conducted at Rajendra Agricultural University, Bihar where Kisan Mela was organized for three days from 5-7<sup>th</sup> March, 2016. Hundred twenty participants of

Kisan Mela were randomly contacted with the help of structured schedule for eliciting the information by personal interview method. The data were analyzed with the help of frequency and percentage.

**Results and Discussion**

**Socio-economic and personal profile of the respondents (Table 1)**

**Perception of farmers about usefulness of Kisan Mela**

The extent of usefulness of the information given at farmer’s fair both in agricultural and other subsidiary occupation as perceived by farmers were quantified as “more useful”, “useful” and “ less useful”. The data presented in table 2 revealed that more than fifty percent of the respondents perceived that information received at farmers fair on High yielding varieties of seed, Agricultural implements & machine, information on high-tech horticulture, information on IFS, Dairy & AH, Fisheries, Agro- forestry, Mushroom Cultivation, Vermicomposting, Organic farming, Medicinal & herbal planting and models, charts & poster display in farmers fair were more useful.

Majority of respondents also felt that the information received at farmers fair like information of fertilizers, information of pesticides, irrigation methods, agriculture weather information, Bio fertilizers and models, charts & poster were useful to them. Similarly more than fifty percent of respondents perceived that information received in farmers fair in the area of contingency crop planning and seed storage & processing were less useful.

It can be concluded that maximum numbers of participants were middle age group, had matriculation level of education, belong to OBC category, untrained with small land holding and agriculture and subsidiary was major occupation. Good majority of participating farmers perceived that information received at Kisan Mela on Agricultural implements & machine, IFS, Dairy & AH, Mushroom Cultivation and Medicinal & herbal planting were more useful. Therefore, special emphasis was given on selected dimension by policy makers and planners while organising the Kisan Mela.

This will lead to enhance the adoption of technology by the farmers in special and effectiveness of Kisan Mela in general.

**Table.1 Socio-economic and personal profile of the respondents**

Category	Total (N=120)	
	Frequency(f)	%
<b>Age</b>		
Young (up to 35years)	24	20.00
Middle (36-50 years )	44	36.66
Advanced (51-65 Years)	42	35.00
Old (above 65 years)	10	8.33
<b>Education</b>		
Primary	25	20.83
Matriculation	34	28.33
Intermediate	29	24.16

Graduate & above	32	26.66
<b>Size of land holding</b>		
Marginal (below1 hac )	41	34.16
Small (1-4 hac )	56	46.66
Medium (4.1-10 hac )	14	11.66
Large (above 10 hac )	09	7.50
<b>Annual income</b>		
Low (below Rs.50,000)	32	26.66
Medium( Rs.50,000-1,00,000)	54	45.00
High( Rs. 1,00,001-1,50,000)	24	20.00
Very high( above 1,50,000)	10	8.33
<b>Family size</b>		
Joint	61	50.83
Nuclear	59	49.16
<b>Occupation</b>		
Agriculture alone	52	43.33
Agril.+ Subsidiary	60	50.00
Others	08	6.66
<b>Training</b>		
Trained	41	34.16
Un-trained	79	65.83
<b>Category</b>		
General	37	30.83
OBC	77	64.16
SC/ST	06	5.00
<b>Media ownership</b>		
Television	92	76.66
Radio	105	87.50
Newspaper	112	93.33
Magazine	40	33.33
Mobile Phone	102	85.00
Computer	08	6.66
<b>Members of Group/Club/Voluntary organisation</b>		
None	68	56.66
one	39	32.50
Two	11	9.16
More than two	2	1.66

**Table.2** Farmers Perception of usefulness of KisanMela (N= 120)

Sl.No.	Items	More Useful		Useful		Less Useful	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1.	High Yielding Varieties of seed	62	51.66	37	30.83	21	17.50
2.	Information of fertilizers	17	14.16	63	52.50	40	33.33
3.	Information of pesticides	16	13.33	52	43.33	52	43.33
4.	Agricultural implements & machine	74	61.66	36	30.00	10	8.33
5.	Irrigation methods	48	40.00	56	46.66	16	13.33
6.	Soil and water conservation	41	34.16	44	36.66	35	29.16
7.	Information on high-tech horticulture	58	48.33	62	51.66	0	0.00
8.	Information on Kitchen gardening	32	26.66	38	31.66	50	41.66
9.	Information on IFS	64	53.33	36	30.00	20	16.66
10.	Dairy &AH	61	50.83	40	33.33	19	15.83
11.	Fisheries	54	45.00	48	40.00	18	15.00
12.	Agro forestry	52	43.33	54	45.00	14	11.66
13.	Ag. Weather Information	32	26.66	60	50.00	28	23.33
14.	Dry farming technology	22	18.33	33	27.50	65	54.16
15.	Bio fertilizers	43	35.83	56	46.66	21	17.50
16.	Mushroom Cultivation	66	500	43	35.83	11	9.16
17.	Honey bee rearing	30	25.00	32	26.66	52	43.00
18.	Vermicomposting	58	48.33	34	28.33	28	23.33
19.	Organic farming	51	42.50	36	30.00	33	27.50
20.	Medicinal & herbal planting	64	53.33	39	32.50	17	14.16
21.	Sugarcane	48	40.00	45	37.50	27	22.50
22.	Contingency Crop planning	12	10.00	27	22.50	81	67.50
23.	Seed Storage &Processing	22	18.33	38	31.66	60	50.00
24.	Models/ Charts /Poster	52	43.33	57	47.50	11	9.16

**References**

Gangadharappa, N.R. and Jayaramaiah, K.M. (1985). A critical analysis of Krishimela. *Current Research*, 14(3):19-20.  
 Manjula, N and Sheikh, M.K. (2010). Impact of Krishimela on participating

farmers. *Agricultural Update*, 5(I):54-58  
 Sharma, A. and Hasan, S. (2012). Impact of farmers fair on participating farmers. *J Communication Studies*, 31:146-155.