

## Original Research Article

# Personal Characteristics of Greengram Growers Latur District of Maharashtra State

S.S. Mane<sup>1</sup>, S.L. Pulate<sup>1</sup>, D.N. Sawandkar<sup>2</sup> and D.D. Suradkar<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Extension Education, VNMKV, Parabhani, Maharashtra, India

<sup>2</sup>Agriculture Assistant, VNMKV, Parbhani, Maharashtra, India

*\*Corresponding author*

## ABSTRACT

The study was conducted in Latur district of Marathwada region of Maharashtra state. The result made it clear that, majority of the green gram growers had experience of 22 to 41 years, majority of them have middle school level of education, higher percentage of green gram growers were found in semi-medium land holding category, higher proportion of the green gram growers had medium social participation. Most of the green gram growers had medium annual income, majority of the respondents were having medium economic motivation. Most of the green gram growers were in the medium risk orientation category. More than half of the green gram growers used medium sources of information.

### Keywords

Green gram,  
adoption,  
personal  
characters

## Introduction

Greengram is protein rich staple food. It contains about protein which is almost three times that of cereals. In vegetarian diet in addition to fat, minerals and carbohydrates, beside it provides vitamin A, riboflavin and essential amino acids. It is easily digestible and in absence of milk it is considered as excellent food. It is consumed in the form of split pulses as well as whole pulses, which is essential supplement of cereal based diet.

Greengram also plays important role in sustaining soil fertility by improving soil physical properties and leaves nitrogen effect for succeeding crops and thus minimize deficiency of chemical fertilizers which lead to environmental pollution.

Generally, the production and productivity of pulses including greengram is very low, because the crop is grown on marginal land with poor management practices, low rainfall, high rate of flowers and fruits drop pest and diseases. All the pulse growers do not adopt the recommended agricultural practices only few of farmers are innovators, other adopts late and few of them do not adopt. One does not adopt as soon as he hears of an improved farm practice, as adoption is a mental process which takes certain time.

Some of farmers having knowledge about new practices but they are not adopted at all so, this paper examines personal characteristics of green gram growers.

## Materials and Methods

The present study was carried out in the Latur district of Marathwada region of Maharashtra state. The sample comprised 120 respondents.

### Mean

Mean of sample was calculated by summing all the individual score and dividing it by number of cases. The formula is

$$X = \frac{\sum X}{N}$$

Where,

X = Arithmetic mean

$\sum X$  = Sum of respondent's score

N = Number of cases

### Standard deviation

Standard Deviation is a measure of variability calculated around mean. It was denoted by Greek letter 'δ' (sigma) and calculated with the following formula.

$$\delta = (\text{S.D.}) = \sqrt{\frac{N\sum X^2 - (\sum X)^2}{N}}$$

Whereas,

δ = (S.D.) = Standard deviation

$\sum X^2$  = Sum of square of 'X' series

$(\sum X)^2$  = Square of summation 'X' series

N = Number of green gram growers

N = Number of green gram growers

## Results and Discussion

### Farming experience

It is revealed from table 2 that 65.84 per cent of the greengram growers had experience of 22 to 41 years, while 17.50 per cent had

experience of up to 21 years and 16.66 per cent respondents had more than 42 years farming experience.

### Education

The data from table 3 clearly shows that 6.67 per cent of the greengram growers were non educated, 7.50 per cent of them were can read and write only while, 12.50 per cent educated up to primary school level and 35.00 per cent of them have middle school level of education, 33.33 and 5.00 per cent of the greengram growers were educated up to high school level and college level, respectively.

### Land holding

As regards with the land holding, it is evident from the table 4 that higher percentage (59.16 per cent) of greengram growers were found in semi-medium land holding category, 9.17 percent were in small land holding category and 5.83 and 24.17 per cent of them from marginal and medium land holding category, respectively. Only, 1.67 per cent of the greengram growers were found in big land holding category.

### Social participation

It is elucidated from table 5 that majority (61.67 per cent) of the greengram growers had medium social participation while, 22.50 per cent of them had high social participation. Only, 15.83 per cent of greengram growers were having low level of social participation.

### Annual income

It is observed that from table 6, 76.67 per cent of greengram growers had medium annual income followed by 14.17 and 9.16 per cent had low and high annual income, respectively.

**Table.1** Variables and their empirical measurements

Variables	Measurements
<b>Independent Variables</b>	
1. Farming experience	No. of years actually spent by greengram growers in farming
2. Education	Education obtained in terms of the standard of schooling by the greengram growers
3. Land holding	Total area of land owned by greengram growers
4. Social participation	Individual's involvement in the activities of formal and informal organizations
5. Annual income	Total earning from all sources in rupees by all the family members in a year
6. Economic motivation	Schedule was developed
7. Risk orientation	Scale developed by Supe (1969) was used
8. Use of sources of information	Structured schedule was developed to work out score.

**Table.2** Distribution of the greengram growers according to their farming experience

Experience level	Frequency	Percentage
1. Low	21	17.50
2. Medium	79	65.84
3. High	20	16.66
Total	120	100.00

**Table.3** Distribution of greengram growers according to their education

Education level	Frequency	Percentage
1. Illiterate	08	6.67
2. can read and write only	09	7.50
3. Primary school level	15	12.50
4. Middle school level	42	35.00
5. High school level	40	33.33
6. College level	06	5.00
Total	120	100.00

**Table.4** Distribution of greengram growers according to their land holding

Category	Frequency	Percentage
1. Marginal farmer	7	5.83
2. Small farmer	11	9.17
3. Semi medium farmer	71	59.16
4. Medium farmer	29	24.17
4. Big farmer	02	1.67
Total	120	100.00

**Table.5** Distribution of greengram growers according to their Social participation

Category	Frequency	Percentage
1. Low	19	15.83
2. Medium	74	61.67
3. High	27	22.50
Total	120	100.00

**Table.6** Distribution of greengram growers according to their annual income

Category	Frequency	Percentage
1. Low	17	14.17
2. Medium	92	76.67
3. High	11	9.16
Total	120	100.00

**Table.7** Distribution of greengram growers according to their economic motivation

Category	Frequency	Percentage
1. Low	15	12.50
2. Medium	72	60.00
3. High	33	27.50
Total	120	100.00

**Table.8** Distribution of greengram growers according to their risk orientation

Category	Frequency	Percentage
1. Low	9	7.50
2. Medium	83	69.17
3. High	28	23.33
Total	120	100.00

**Table.9** Distribution of greengram growers according to their use of sources of information

Category	Frequency	Percentage
1. Low	18	15.00
2. Medium	71	59.17
3. High	31	25.83
Total	120	100.00

### **Economic motivation**

The following table indicates that a majority (60.00 per cent) of the respondents were having medium economic motivation, while 12.50 per cent of them had low economic motivation. Further it was found that 27.50 per cent of the respondents had high economic motivation.

### **Risk orientation**

Table 8 delineate that majority (69.17 per cent) of the greengram growers were in the medium risk orientation category while, 7.50 per cent and 23.33 per cent were low and high risk orientation categories, respectively.

### **Use of sources of information**

It is revealed from table 9 that more than half (59.17 per cent) of the greengram growers used medium sources of

information while, 15.00 per cent low and 25.83 per cent high use of sources of information category.

### **References**

- Asane, P.G. 2003. Knowledge and adoption of cultivation practice recommended for soybean. M.Sc. (Agri.) Thesis, Dr. P.D.K.V., Akola.
- Dhage, D.H. 1993. A study on impact of first line demonstration on gram. M.Sc. (Agri.) Thesis, Marathwada Krishi Vidyapeeth Parbhani.
- Ramteke, A.S. 2001. Adoption of recommended package of practices of pigeonpea. M.Sc. (Agri.) Thesis, Marathwada Krishi Vidyapeeth Parbhani.
- Shakya, M.S., M.M. Patel and V.B. Singh 2008. Knowledge level of chick pea growers about chick pea production technology. *Indian Res. J. Extn. Edu.* 8 (2 and 3).