IMPACT: International Journal of Research in Applied, Natural and Social Sciences (IMPACT: IJRANSS)
ISSN(P): 2347-4580; ISSN(E): 2321-8851
Vol. 5, Issue 2, Feb 2017, 1-12

STUDY OF PROFILE CHARACTERISTICS OF WHEAT AND MAIZE GROWERS IN UDAIPUR DISTRICT OF RAJASTHAN

SUNITA KUMARI[1], F. L. SHARMA[2] & NIDHI[3]

[1,2]Department of Extension Education, MPUAT, Udaipur, Rajasthan, India

[3]Department of Extension Education, JAU, Junagadh, Gujarat, India

ABSTRACT

The present study was conducted in Udaipur district of Rajasthan. There are eleven panchayat samities in Udaipur district of Rajasthan, out of which two tribal (Jhadol and Sarada) and two non-tribal (Bhinder and Mavli) panchayat samities were selected on the basis of maximum number of farmers are benefitted under RKVY programme. Four villages having maximum number of beneficiaries of RKVY were selected from each identified panchayat samiti. Thus, sixteen villages were selected as beneficiary villages. Likewise, two distant villages were selected from each identified panchayat samiti where, the RKVY was not in operation. Thus, eight villages were selected as non-beneficiary villages. Ten wheat and maize growers selected randomly from each selected village. Data were collected from selected respondents by employing personal interview technique. Thereafter, data were analyzed, tabulated and results were interpreted. It was observed that nearly 40.02 per cent of the respondents were from middle age group of 35 to 44 years and they were educated up to primary class. It was also observed that nearly 47.92 per cent respondents had medium economic motivation.

KEYWORDS: Beneficiary and Non-Beneficiary Respondents, RKVY, Economic Motivation

INTRODUCTION

The GDP of agriculture increased annually at more than 3 per cent during 1980s. Since, Ninth Five-Year Plan (1996 to 2001-02), India has been targeting a growth rate of more than 4 per cent in agriculture but the actual achievement has been much below the target. More than 50 per cent of the work force of the country still depends upon agriculture for their livelihood and presently the growth rate is 3.5 per cent in 2012. Slow growth in agriculture and allied sectors can lead to acute stress in the economy because the population dependent upon this sector is still very large. A major cause behind the slow growth in agriculture is the consistent decrease in investments in this sector by the state governments, while public and private investments are increasing manifold in sectors such as infrastructure, industry etc. but investments are not forthcoming in agriculture and allied sectors, leading to distress in the community of farmers, especially that of the small and marginal segment. Hence, the need for incentivizing states to increase their investments in the agriculture and allied sectors has been felt.

Concerned by the slow growth in the agriculture and allied sectors, the National Development Council (NDC), in its meeting held on 29th May, 2007, resolved that a special additional central assistance scheme namely Rastriya Krishi Vikas Yojana (RKVY) be launched. The RKVY aims at achieving 5.5% annual growth in the agriculture sector during 12th plan period by ensuring a holistic development of agriculture and allied sectors.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

The present study was conducted in Udaipur district of Rajasthan. Udaipur was selected purposively on the basis of maximum number of beneficiaries are benefited through recommended interventions of cereal crops introduced under RKVY programme in southern Rajasthan. There are eleven panchayat samities in Udaipur district of Rajasthan, out of which two tribal (Jhadol and Sarada) and two non-tribal (Bhinder and Mavli) panchayat samities were selected on the basis of maximum number of farmers are benefitted under RKVY programme. For selection of villages, four villages having maximum number of beneficiaries of RKVY were selected from each identified panchayat samiti. Thus, sixteen villages were selected as beneficiary villages. Likewise, two distant villages were selected from each identified panchayat samiti where, the RKVY was not in operation. Thus, eight villages were selected as non-beneficiary villages. To select the beneficiary respondents, a comprehensive list of beneficiary wheat and maize growers was prepared with the help of personnel of Deputy Director Agriculture (Extension) office from the selected villages. The list so prepared, ten respondents who got interventions of wheat and maize crop were selected randomly from each selected village. Thus, total 160 beneficiary respondents were selected by adopting random sample technique from each identified village. Likewise, 80 non-beneficiary respondents were selected by randomly from each identified village. Thus, in all 240 respondents (160 beneficiary and 80 non-beneficiary respondents) were included in the sample of study. Data were collected from selected respondents by employing personal interview technique. Thereafter, data were analyzed, tabulated and results were interpreted.

RESULT AND DISCUSSIONS

In this section, data relating to personal characteristics of the respondents *viz.*, caste, age, education, experience in wheat and maize cultivation, family size, family type, size of land holding, income level, extension contact, cosmopolitan outlook and economic motivation have been presented. The results have been presented in subsequent tables.

Caste of Respondents

On the basis of their caste, the respondents were classified into four categories *i.e.* SC, ST, OBC and General.

The data presented in Table 1 depict that out of total 240 respondents, 84(35.00%) respondents belonged to Scheduled Caste. This was followed by 65 (27.08%) respondents who belongs to Scheduled Tribe; whereas 61(25.41%) and 30(12.50%) respondents were reported to be from Other Backward Class and General Caste, respectively.

The data further reveals that 37.50 per cent beneficiary and 30.00 per cent non-beneficiary respondents belong to scheduled caste. Somewhat similar but contradictory difference can be seen in scheduled tribes wherein 25.62 per cent beneficiary and 30.00 per cent non-beneficiary respondents belong to this category. On the other hand, 26.25 per cent beneficiary and 23.75 per cent non-beneficiary respondents belong to Other Backward Class; whereas only 10.62 per cent beneficiary and 16.25 per cent non-beneficiary respondents belong to general category.

The findings are in line with the findings of Rathore (2002), Singh (2002), Ramakrishan(2004) and Ranawat(2011).

Age of Respondents

On the basis of their age, the respondents were classified into three categories *i.e.* less than 35 years, 35 to 44

years and above 44 years age.

The data incorporated in the Table 2 vividly corroborate that majority of the total respondents belongs to the age group of 35 to 44 years. This age group alone constitutes 40.41 per cent of the total sample. Whereas, 32.92 and 26.67 per cent respondents were from less than 35 years and above 44 years age groups respectively.

The table further reveals that 38.75 per cent beneficiary respondents and 43.75 per cent non-beneficiary respondents selected under study belonged to the age group of 35 to 44 years. Whereas, 37.50 per cent beneficiary respondents and 23.75 per cent non-beneficiary respondents belonged to age group of less than 35 years. The representation of above 44 years age groups the beneficiary respondents and non-beneficiary respondents were found to be 23.75 and 32.50 per cent, respectively.

A close observation of the data further indicate that in tribal and non-tribal area's respondents highest among the beneficiary and non-beneficiary categories i.e., 33, 29, 13 and 22 respondents were in age group of 35 to 44 years, respectively.

From the above facts, it can be concluded that nearly half of beneficiary and non-beneficiary respondents were from 35 to 44 years age group. The probable reason might be that this age considered is an actively working age of respondents and being responsible for maintenance their families.

The findings are supported by the findings of Upadhyay (2000), Singh (1996) and Singh (2000), Kumar (2008).

Educational Level of Respondents

To develop an understanding about the level of education of selected respondents, they were classified into four categories i.e. illiterate, up to primary class, up to higher secondary class and above higher secondary class. Their frequencies were counted and converted into percentage for all the categories of respondents. The results were presented in Table 3.

The data evident from the Table 6 that 23.33 per cent of total respondents were educated upto higher secondary class. In the same category beneficiary and non-beneficiary respondents were 24.37 per cent and 21.25 per cent, respectively. Whereas 26.25 per cent (25.63% beneficiary and 27.50% non-beneficiary) respondents were illiterate and 33.75 per cent (31.25% beneficiary and 33.75% non-beneficiary) respondents were up to primary level. Only 16.67 per cent (16.25% beneficiary and 17.50% non-beneficiary) respondents were above high secondary level.

A close observation to the data of tribal and non-tribal area's respondents reveals that in case of beneficiary respondents, 26(32.50%) non-tribal area's respondents and 13(16.25%) tribal area's respondents had education upto high secondary level. Whereas, in case of non-beneficiary respondents, the majority of tribal (37.50%) and non-tribal (30.00%) area's respondents selected under study belonged up to primary level. Further, analysis of the table clearly indicates that non-tribal area's respondents were more educated than tribal area's respondents.

The findings are conformity with the findings of Kumar (2012), Upadhyay (2000), and Patel (2006).

Experience in Wheat and Maize Cultivation

Experience helps the respondents to acquire latest knowledge about agriculture technology and solves their

problems with the help of extension personnel. Sharing the experience by interacting with each other may increase confidence, which may result in high rate of adoption of technology. With a view to classify the respondents on the basis of experience, three categories were formulated on the basis of actual years of practicing agriculture. The results regarding experience are presented in Table 4.

The data incorporate in the Table 4 clearly shows that out of the total respondents, 112 (46.66%) were found to have 16-30 years of experience, followed by 52 (21.67%) and 76 (31.67%) having low and high level of experience, respectively.

Based on the Table 4, it is concluded that majority of the beneficiary respondents possessed medium level of experience i.e., 50.00 per cent and the maximum non-beneficiary respondents possessed low level of experience i.e., 43.75 per cent in experience in wheat and maize cultivation. It may be due to the reason that the beneficiary respondents regularly contact with field supervisors and other experts of agriculture.

A close observation to the data between tribal and non-tribal area's respondents reveals that in case of beneficiary respondents, 37(46.25%) tribal area's respondents and 43(53.75%) non-tribal area's respondents had medium level of experience. Whereas, in case of non-beneficiary respondents, the majority of tribal 17(42.50%) and non-tribal 18 (45.00%) area's respondents selected under study belonged to low level of experience in wheat and maize cultivation. Further, analysis of the table clearly indicates that beneficiary of non-tribal area respondents were more experience than beneficiary tribal area respondents in wheat and maize cultivation. The findings are conformity with the findings of Samota (2011).

Size of Family

Table 5 indicates that out of 240 respondents, 62.08 per cent respondents were from small families having upto five members. While, remaining 37.92 per cent respondents were from large families having more than 5 members.

Analysis of table further shows those 58.75 per cent beneficiary respondents and 68.75 per cent non-beneficiary respondents were belonged to small size of family group. While, 41.25 per cent beneficiaries and 31.25 per cent non-beneficiaries of RKVY were categorized in large size of family group.

It can be concluded that nearly 62.08% of the respondents had small size of family. The probable reason for this might be the majority of the wheat and maize growers belonged to nuclear families in the study area so that more number of respondents was found in small size of family.

A close observation to the data of tribal and non-tribal area's respondents reveals that in case of beneficiary respondents, 39(48.75%) tribal area's respondents and 55(68.75%) non-tribal area's respondents had small size of family. Whereas, in case of non-beneficiary respondents, the majority of tribal 26(65.00%) and non-tribal 29(72.50%) area's respondents selected under study belonged to large size family. Further analysis of the table clearly indicates that in both categories the majority of non-tribal area's respondents were found in small size of family. This finding is in contradictory with the finding of Rathod (2009).

Family Type of Respondents

Family type of the respondents also plays an important role in the process of adoption of agricultural production technology. To develop an understanding about the family type of selected respondents they were classified into two

categories, i.e. nuclear and joint family. The results about family type are presented in Table 6.

The data presented in the Table 6 vividly corroborate that 57.92 per cent of the total respondents belonged to nuclear families and remaining 42.08 per cent respondents belonged to the families which are joint in composition. Further analysis of table reveals that 60.62 per cent beneficiary respondents and 52.50 per cent non-beneficiary respondents were from nuclear family group. Whereas, 39.38 per cent beneficiaries and 47.50 per cent non-beneficiaries were found to be from joint family category. It is interesting to note that still good number of respondents from both the categories were maintaining joint family concept in the villages. The reason behind this may be due to the fact that more human resource is required for successful cultivation of agricultural crops.

Further, analysis of the table shows that the concept of nuclear family was highest in both the categories (i.e. tribal & non-tribal area's respondents). The present findings are in accordance with the findings of Nandwana (2004) who reported that 67.46 per cent respondents had joint family composition. Sharma *et al*. (2004-05) indicated that respondents having nuclear family were 62.58 per cent and joint family was 37.71 per cent.

Size of Land Holding

The data contained in Table 7 show that 55.42 per cent of total respondents had marginal land holding (upto 1 ha), followed by 29.58 per cent of them having small size of land holding (1-2 ha), whereas, 15.00 per cent of them were large respondents having land holding above 2 hectares.

A close observation of the data further indicates that in case of beneficiary respondents, 50.00 per cent had marginal land holding, followed by 31.87 per cent of them having small size of land holding and only 18.13 per cent beneficiary respondents had large land holding. Whereas, 66.25 per cent of non-beneficiary respondents had marginal land holding followed by 25.00 per cent of them having small size of land holding and remaining 8.75 per cent non-beneficiary respondents had large land holding in the study area.

From the above results it can be concluded that more than 50.00 per cent respondents possessed land holding up to 1 hectare in the study area.

A close observation to the data about tribal and non-tribal area's respondents reveals that in case of beneficiary respondents, the majority of tribal area's respondents 61(76.25%) had marginal land holding and 47.50 per cent non-tribal area's respondents had small size of land holding. Whereas, in case of non-beneficiary respondents the majority of both the categories respondents fell in marginal land holding. The present findings are supported by the findings of Shrivastava *et al.* (2002) who reported that 61.67 per cent of the respondents had small size of land holding followed by marginal respondents and large respondents.

Income Level

The data included in the Table 8 visualize that out of the total 240 respondents, 47.92 per cent respondents had their annual income up to Rs.65000 per annum from all sources and 26.25 per cent wheat and maize growers had their family income more than Rs.75000 per annum, while remaining 25.83 per cent respondents earned their family income from Rs. 65000-75000 per annum from all sources in the study area.

A comparative view of annual income of beneficiary and non-beneficiary wheat and maize growers highlights that majority of beneficiary respondents (41.25%) and non-beneficiary respondents (61.25%) were in the low income group i.e. upto Rs. 65000 per year. Further, 28.75 per cent of beneficiary respondents and 20.00 per cent of non-beneficiary respondents had their annual income from Rs. 65000-75000 per year. Whereas, 30.00 per cent beneficiary respondents and 18.75 per cent non-beneficiary respondents were found in the high income group (more than Rs. 75000 per annum) in the study area. From the above results it can be concluded that beneficiary respondents had more annual income than non-beneficiary respondents.

A close observation to the data about tribal and non-tribal area's respondents reveals that in case of beneficiary and non-beneficiary of tribal areas possessed low level of income. Whereas, in case of beneficiary and non-beneficiary of non-tribal areas respondents possessed high level of income. Further, analysis of the table shows that the non-tribal area's respondents had more income as compare to tribal area's respondents. The findings are similar to the findings of Kumari (2006) and Verma (2010).

Extension Contact of Respondents

With a view to classify the respondents on the basis of extension contact, three categories were formulated *viz.*, low level (< 5.87 scores), medium level (5.87 to 8.55 scores) and high level (> 8.55 scores) of extension contact. The results have been presented in Table 9.

The data presented in Table 9 visualize that out of 240 respondents, 55.83 per cent respondents were reported to have medium level of extension contact, whereas, 23.75 per cent respondents reported to have low level of extension contact and remaining 20.42 per cent respondents were observed in high level of extension contact.

A close observation of data in Table 9 further shows that majority of wheat and maize growers from both the categories of respondents were observed in medium level of extension contact i.e. 51.87 and 63.75 per cent for beneficiary and non-beneficiary respondents respectively, whereas, 22.50 and 26.25 per cent beneficiary and non-beneficiary respondents were from low level of extension contact respectively. Further noted that 25.63 and 10.00 per cent beneficiary and non-beneficiary respondents were reported to be from high level of extension contact respectively. From the above data it can be concluded that beneficiary respondents had more extension contact than non-beneficiary respondents on account of being beneficiaries of RKVY programme. The findings are similar to the findings of Kumar (2012).

Cosmopolitan Outlook of the Respondents

To develop an understanding about the nature of cosmopolite of respondents about wheat and maize cultivation, they were classified into three categories i.e. low level (< 8.61 scores), medium level (8.61 to 11.01 scores) and high level (> 11.01 scores). Their frequencies were counted and converted into percentage for all the categories of respondents. The results regarding cosmopolitan outlook were presented in Table 10.

The data recorded in Table 10 show that 55.00 per cent of total respondents were in category of medium level of cosmopolitan outlook, whereas, 19.17 per cent wheat and maize growers were under low level of cosmopolitan outlook and remaining 25.83 per cent respondents recorded in high level of cosmopolitan outlook group.

Further analysis of Table 10 reveals that 51.25 per cent beneficiary respondents and 62.50 per cent non-beneficiary respondents were categorized in medium level of cosmopolitan outlook. While, 19.37 per cent beneficiary respondents and 18.75 per cent non- beneficiary respondents were placed under low level of cosmopolitan outlook. It was further noted that the proportion of beneficiary and non-beneficiary respondents were 29.38 and 18.75 per cent in high level of cosmopolitan outlook respectively.

A close observation of the table further shows that majority of the tribal and non-tribal area's respondents in both categories possessed medium level of cosmopolitan outlook.

The present findings are in line with the findings of Sharma *et al.* (2008), Patel (2006) and Rathod (2009).

Economic Motivation of the Respondents

On the basis of the economic motivation of respondents, they were classified into three categories, i.e. low level of economic motivation (< 7.25 scores), medium level of economic motivation (7.25 to 10.37 scores) and high level of economic motivation (> 10.37 scores). The results regarding economic motivation were presented in Table 11.

A perusal of data presented in Table 11 reveals that out of total 240 respondents, 47.92 per cent wheat and maize growers were reported to be medium level of economic motivation. Whereas, 30.00 per cent of total respondents were in low level of economic motivation and remaining 22.08 per cent respondents were reported to be high level of economic motivation.

Table 11 further indicates that 49.38 and 45.00 per cent beneficiary and non-beneficiary respondents were categorized as medium level of economic motivation respectively. While, 23.75 and 42.50 per cent beneficiary and non-beneficiary respondents were placed under low level of economic motivation, respectively. The representation of beneficiary and non-beneficiary respondents were found in high level category of economic motivation was 26.87 and 12.50 per cent respectively. It means the majority of respondents were in medium category of economic motivation. The present findings are in line with the findings of Kumar (2012).

Table 1: Distribution of Respondents According to their Caste n =240

S.NO.	Category	Beneficiary						Non-Beneficiary						Grand Total	
		Tribal Area		Non-Tribal Area		Total		Tribal Area		Non-Tribal Area		Total			
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1.	SC	36	45.00	24	30.00	60	37.50	14	35.00	10	25.00	24	30.00	84	35.00
2.	ST	24	30.00	17	21.25	41	25.62	16	40.00	8	20.00	24	30.00	65	27.08
3	OBC	13	16.25	29	36.25	42	26.25	6	15.00	13	32.50	19	23.75	61	25.41
4.	General	7	8.75	10	12.50	17	10.63	4	10.00	9	22.50	13	16.25	30	12.50
	Total	**80**	**100**	**80**	**100**	**160**	**100**	**40**	**100**	**40**	**100**	**80**	**100**	**240**	**100**

f = frequency, % = per cent

Table 2: Distribution of Respondents According to their Age n =240

S.NO.	Category	Beneficiary						Non-beneficiary						Grand Total	
		Tribal Area		Non-Tribal Area		Total		Tribal Area		Non-Tribal Area		Total			
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1.	Low (< 35 years)	29	36.25	31	38.75	60	37.50	13	32.50	6	15.00	19	23.75	79	32.92
2.	Medium (35 to 44 years)	33	41.25	29	36.25	62	38.75	13	32.50	22	55.00	35	43.75	97	40.41
3	High (> 44 years)	18	22.50	20	25.00	38	23.75	14	35.00	12	30.00	26	32.50	64	26.67
4.	**Total**	**80**	**100**	**80**	**100**	**160**	**100**	**40**	**100**	**40**	**100**	**80**	**100**	**240**	**100**

f = frequency, % = per cent

Table 3: Distribution of Respondents According to their Education n =240

S.NO.	Category	Beneficiary						Non-Beneficiary						Grand Total	
		Tribal Area		Non-Tribal Area		Total		Tribal Area		Non-Tribal Area		Total			
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1.	Illiterate	26	32.50	15	18.75	41	25.63	13	32.50	9	22.50	22	27.50	63	26.25
2.	Up to primary level	29	36.25	25	31.25	54	33.75	15	37.50	12	30.00	27	33.75	81	33.75
3	Up to high secondary	13	16.25	26	32.50	39	24.37	7	17.50	10	25.00	17	21.25	56	23.33
4.	Above high secondary	12	15.00	14	17.50	26	16.25	5	12.50	9	22.50	14	17.50	40	16.67
	TOTAL	**80**	**100**	**80**	**100**	**160**	**100**	**40**	**100**	**40**	**100**	**80**	**100**	**240**	**100**

f = frequency, % = per cent

Table 4: Distribution of Respondents According to Their Experience in Wheat and Maize Cultivation n =240

S.NO.	Category	Beneficiary						Non-Beneficiary						Grand Total	
		Tribal Area		Non-Tribal Area		Total		Tribal Area		Non-Tribal Area		Total			
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1.	Low (< 15 years)	10	12.50	7	8.75	17	10.62	17	42.5	18	45.00	35	43.75	52	21.67
2.	Medium (16 to 30 years)	37	46.25	43	53.75	80	50.00	16	40.00	16	40.00	32	40.00	112	46.66
3	High (> 30 years)	33	41.25	30	37.50	63	39.37	7	17.5	6	15.00	13	16.25	76	31.67
	TOTAL	**80**	**100**	**80**	**100**	**160**	**100**	**40**	**100**	**40**	**100**	**80**	**100**	**240**	**100**

f = frequency, % = per cent

Table 5: Distribution of Respondents According to Their Size of Family n =240

S.NO.	Category	Beneficiary						Non-Beneficiary						Grand Total	
		Tribal Area		Non-Tribal Area		Total		Tribal Area		Non-Tribal Area		Total			
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1.	Small	39	48.75	55	68.75	94	58.75	26	65.00	29	72.50	55	68.75	149	62.08
2.	Large	41	51.25	25	31.25	66	41.25	14	35.00	11	27.50	25	31.25	91	37.92
	Total	**80**	**100**	**80**	**100**	**160**	**100**	**40**	**100**	**40**	**100**	**80**	**100**	**240**	**100**

f = frequency, % = per cent

Table 6: Distribution of Respondents According to Their Type of Family n =240

S.NO.	Category	Beneficiary						Non-Beneficiary						Grand Total	
		Tribal Area		Non-Tribal Area		Total		Tribal Area		Non-Tribal Area		Total			
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1.	Nuclear	44	55.00	53	66.25	97	60.62	23	57.50	19	47.50	42	52.50	139	57.92
2.	Joint	36	45.00	27	33.75	63	39.38	17	42.50	21	52.50	38	47.50	101	42.08
	Total	**80**	**100**	**80**	**100**	**160**	**100**	**40**	**100**	**40**	**100**	**80**	**100**	**240**	**100**

f = frequency, % = per cent

Table 7: Distribution of Respondents According to Their Size of Land Holding n =240

S.NO.	Category	Beneficiary						Non-Beneficiary						Grand Total	
		Tribal Area		Non-Tribal Area		Total		Tribal Area		Non-Tribal Area		Total			
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1.	Marginal (upto 1 ha)	61	76.25	19	23.75	80	50.00	31	77.50	22	55.00	53	66.25	133	55.42
2.	Small (between 1 to 2 ha)	13	16.25	38	47.50	51	31.87	7	17.50	13	32.50	20	25.00	71	29.58
3.	Big (above 2 ha)	6	7.50	23	28.75	29	18.13	2	5.00	5	12.50	7	8.75	36	15.00
	Total	**80**	**100**	**80**	**100**	**160**	**100**	**40**	**100**	**40**	**100**	**80**	**100**	**240**	**100**

f = frequency, % = per cent

Table 8: Distribution of Respondents According to their Annual Income n =240

S.NO.	Category	Beneficiary						Non-Beneficiary						Grand Total	
		Tribal Area		Non-Tribal Area		Total		Tribal Area		Non-Tribal Area		Total			
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1.	Low (< 65000)	40	50.00	26	32.50	66	41.25	23	57.5	26	65.00	49	61.25	115	47.92
2.	Medium (66000 to 75000)	21	26.25	25	31.25	46	28.75	10	25.00	6	15.00	16	20.00	62	25.83
3.	High (> 75000)	19	23.75	29	36.25	48	30.00	7	17.50	8	20.00	15	18.75	63	26.25
	Total	**80**	**100**	**80**	**100**	**160**	**100**	**40**	**100**	**40**	**100**	**80**	**100**	**240**	**100**

f = frequency, % = per cent

Table 9: Distribution of Respondents According to their Extension Contact n =240

S.NO.	Category	Beneficiary						Non-Beneficiary						Grand Total	
		Tribal Area		Non-Tribal Area		Total		Tribal Area		Non-Tribal Area		Total			
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1.	Low (< 5.87)	21	26.25	15	18.75	36	22.50	11	27.50	10	25.00	21	26.25	57	23.75
2.	Medium (5.87 to 8.55)	40	50.00	43	53.75	83	51.87	26	65.00	25	62.50	51	63.75	134	55.83
3.	High (> 8.55)	19	23.75	22	27.50	41	25.63	3	7.50	5	12.50	8	10.00	49	20.42
	Total	**80**	**100**	**80**	**100**	**160**	**100**	**40**	**100**	**40**	**100**	**80**	**100**	**240**	**100**

f = frequency, % = per cent

Table 10: Distribution of Respondents According to their Cosmopolitan Outlook n =240

S.NO.	Category	Beneficiary						Non-Beneficiary						Grand Total	
		Tribal Area		Non-Tribal Area		Total		Tribal Area		Non-Tribal Area		Total			
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1.	Low (< 8.61)	19	23.75	12	15.00	31	19.37	12	30.00	3	7.50	15	18.75	46	19.17
2.	Medium (8.61 to 11.01)	42	52.50	40	50.00	82	51.25	23	57.50	27	67.50	50	62.50	132	55.00
3.	High (> 11.01)	19	23.75	28	35.00	47	29.38	5	12.50	10	25.00	15	18.75	62	25.83
4.	**Total**	**80**	**100**	**80**	**100**	**160**	**100**	**40**	**100**	**40**	**100**	**80**	**100**	**240**	**100**

f = frequency, % = per cent

Table 11: Distribution of Respondents According to Their Economic Motivation n =240

S.NO.	Category	Beneficiary						Non-Beneficiary						Grand Total	
		Tribal Area		Non-Tribal Area		Total		Tribal Area		Non-Tribal Area		Total			
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	F	%	f	%	f	%
1.	Low (< 7.25)	20	25.00	18	22.50	38	23.75	16	40.00	18	45.00	34	42.50	72	30.00
2.	Medium (7.25 to 10.37)	41	51.25	38	47.50	79	49.38	20	50.00	16	40.00	36	45.00	115	47.92
3.	High (> 10.37)	19	23.75	24	30.00	43	26.87	4	10.00	6	15.00	10	12.50	53	22.08
	Total	**80**	**100**	**80**	**100**	**160**	**100**	**40**	**100**	**40**	**100**	**80**	**100**	**240**	**100**

f = frequency, % = per cent

CONCLUSIONS

Thus, from the above results, it may be concluded that nearly 40.02 per cent of the respondents were from middle age group of 35 to 44 years and they were educated upto primary class. Majority of wheat growers have experienced in wheat cultivation from 16 to 30 years. While, 62.08 per cent of respondents belonged to small size of family and had medium extension contact. It was further reported that 55.42 per cent of farmers had marginal size of land holding and 26.25 per cent farmers had their annual income above Rs. 75000 per annum. It was also reported that 57.92 per cent respondents belonged to nuclear type of family and had medium cosmopolitan outlook. It was also observed that nearly 47.92 per cent respondents had medium economic motivation.

REFERENCES

1. Kumar, M. 2008. A critical analysis of problems and prospects of groundnut cultivation in sub-humid southern plain and Aravali hills (Zone IV-A) of Rajasthan. Ph.D. thesis submitted to Maharana Pratap University of Agriculture and Technology, Udaipur, Rajasthan.
2. Kumar, R. 2012. Effectiveness of National Food Security Mission in relation to recommended interventions of wheat crop in Udaipur District of Rajasthan. M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis (Unpublished) submitted to Maharana Pratap University of Agriculture and Technology, Udaipur, Rajasthan.
3. Kumari, N. 2006. Knowledge and adoption of garlic production technology by the farmers of Beghu tehsil in Chittorgarh district of Rajasthan. M.Sc. (Ag.) thesis submitted to Maharana Pratap University of Agriculture and Technology, Udaipur, Rajasthan.
4. Nandawana, S.K. 2004. Problems and prospects of soybean [*Glycine max* L.] cultivation technology in Chittorgarh district (Rajasthan). M.Sc. (Ag.) thesis submitted to Maharana Pratap University of Agriculture and Technology, Udaipur, Rajasthan
5. Patel, A.C. 2006. Adoption dynamics of pigeon pea growers in relation to integrated pest management technology of Vadodara district of Gujarat. Ph.D. thesis submitted to Anand Agricultural University, Anand, and Gujarat.
6. Ramakrishan, B. 2004. An analysis of self employed youth through Prime Ministers Rozgar Yojana in Udaipur district of Rajasthan. Ph.D. (Ag.) thesis submitted to Maharana Pratap University of Agriculture and Technology, Udaipur, Rajasthan.
7. Ranawat, Y. 2011. Impact of maize Cultivation Training Programme Conducted by Krishi Vigyan Kendra for farmers of Udaipur District of Rajasthan. M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis (unpub.) submitted to SKRAU, Bikaner.
8. Rathod, J.J. 2009. A study on extent of adoption of recommended plant protection measures by chilli growers in Anand district of Gujarat state, M.Sc. (Ag.) thesis submitted to Anand Agricultural University, Anand, Gujarat.
9. Rathore, S. 2002. Impact of major crop production technologies generated by Agricultural University for the Arid Western Plain Zone of Rajasthan. Ph.D. thesis submitted to Maharana Pratap University of Agriculture and Technology, Udaipur, Rajasthan.
10. Samota, S. D. 2011. Evaluation of NAIP with Special Reference to Interventions Introduced in Wheat cultivation in Banswara District of Rajasthan. M. Sc. thesis submitted to Maharana Pratap University of Agriculture and Technology, Udaipur, Rajasthan.
11. Sharma, A. K., Jha, S. K., Kumar, V., Sachen, R. C. and Kumar, A. 2004-05. Utilization pattern of communication sources and channels by rapeseed & mustard farmers at different stages of innovation decision process. *Rajasthan Journal of Extension Education* **12 & 13**: 31-36.
12. Shrivastava, K.K., Sarkar, J.D. and Lakhera, M.L. 2002. Adoption behavior of farmers about chilli cultivation technology. *Maharashtra Journal of Extension Education* **21:** 59-62.
13. Singh, A. K. 1996. Impact of Krishi Vigyan Kendra in adoption of mustard production technology among the

farmers of Nadbai panchayat samiti of Bharatpur district of Rajasthan. M.Sc. (Ag.) thesis submitted to Rajasthan Agricultural University, Bikaner, and Rajasthan.

14. Singh, B. 2002. Production technology adopted in Rajasthan for moong and moth. *Agricultural Extension Review* **14:** 9-11.
15. Singh, K. 2000. Impact of Front Line Demonstrations on adoption of mustard production technology by the farmers of Bharatpur district of Rajasthan. M.Sc. (Ag.) thesis submitted to Maharana Pratap University of Agriculture and Technology, Udaipur, Rajasthan.
16. Upadhyay, R. 2000. Comparative study of knowledge, attitude and impact of DWCRA programme on tribal and non-tribal beneficiaries of Udaipur district of Rajasthan. Ph.D. (Ag.) thesis submitted to Maharana Pratap University of Agriculture and Technology, Udaipur, Rajasthan.
17. Verma, R.C. 2010. Adoption behaviour of farmers towards rice production technology in Banswara district of Rajasthan. M.Sc. (Ag.) thesis submitted to Maharana Pratap University of Agriculture and Technology, Udaipur, Rajasthan.