ATTITUDE OF PARTICIPANT AND NON-PARTICIPANT FARMERS TOWARDS FARMERS FIELD SCHOOLS

K. ATCHUTA RAJU, K. VIJAYA PRAKASH

Abstract: The study was conducted in Krishna district of Andhra Pradesh. Ex-post-facto research design was followed for this study. A total of 210 farmers (140 trained and 70 untrained) were selected. The study pointed that majority of FFS trained farmers had moderately favourable attitude towards IPM. In case of untrained farmers majority of them belonged to less favorable attitude group.

Keywords: Farmers Field School, Attitude, IPM.

Introduction: Farmers Field Schools (FFS) programme is skill based technology centered, represents a dynamic strategy for minimizing risks in agriculture, in increasing production, quality of the produce and stabilizing income of farmers. The programme has, by and large, resulted in modifying cultivation practices besides incorporating Integrated Pest Management and integrated plant Nutrient Management practices which leads to higher and quality production. The Science and practice of Farmers Field School programme is of recent origin in agriculture, although the contemporary use of the term evolved long back. Keeping this in view a study was conducted to study the attitude of participant and non participant farmers.

Methodology: An ex-post-facto research design was followed. The study was conducted in Krishna district Andhra Pradesh. A total of 210 farmers (140 trained and 70 untrained) were selected. For measuring a respondent's attitude towards FFS, an attitude scale was developed. The data collected by personal interview method. The collected data was analyzed by using frequency and percentage, mean and standard deviation techniques.

Results and Discussion:

Distribution of Trained and Untrained Respondents of FFS Based on Their Attitude: It has been revealed from the table -1 that majority (55.72 %) of the trained farmers expressed moderately favourable attitude and the rest of them were equally distributed under low favourable and more favourable attitude. In case of untrained farmers majority (55.71 %) of them belonged to less favourable attitude group followed by moderately (32.86 %) and more (11.43 %) favourable attitude.

Table 1: Distribution of the Respondents According to Their Attitudes towards Farmers Field Schools with Special Emphasis on IPM Practices

S.No.	Category	Trained (n=140)		Untrained (n=70)	
		Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Less favourable attitude	31	22.14	39	55.71
2.	Moderately favourable attitude	78	55.72	23	32.86
3.	More favourable attitude	31	22.14	8	11.43
	Total	140	100.00	70	100.00
	Mean: 68.29, S.D: 23.808			Mean: 29.34, S.D: 10.17	

The results presented in table -1, clearly indicated that majority of the Farmers Field School trained respondents had moderately favourable attitude and untrained respondents had less favourable attitude towards Integrated Pest Management practices since untrained farmers had not undergone any training on IPM and exposure to IPM related practices.

The trained Farmers Field School respondents had moderately favourable attitude towards IPM as a method of pest control, a measure to maintain the ecological balance. IPM includes both indigenous as well as modern techniques. Farmers whether trained or untrained had faith in the indigenous techniques like deep ploughing, cultural practices and bird perches etc. This might be the reason for the majority of the farmers in the study had shown moderately favourable attitude.

However, the mean scores were high in the case of FFS trained farmers showing significant difference in the attitude when compared with their counterparts. The probable cause for the result could be that other modern or complex techniques such as release of bioagents, use of biopesticides and chemicals must have gone well into their minds creating an impression that the entire IPM package would yield a qualitative product at a lesser cost. The results indicate the need on the part of extension agency to train and educate the farmers regarding the

advantages of adopting recommended Integrated Pest Management Practices for decreasing environmental pollution and getting quality products which in turn will help in developing more favourable attitude among them. For this, special training programmes, demonstrations, educational tours may be undertaken by the extension agency. The findings are in confirmation with the findings of Manoj (2013) and Neha (2013).

Response Analysis of Attitude of Farmers Field Schools (FFS) Trained and Untrained Respondents towards Farmers Field Schools with Special Emphasis on IPM: A thorough response analysis of attitude of FFS trained and untrained respondents towards the attitude statements with varying degrees of positive and negative impressions was made and the related data are furnished accordingly on the nature and magnitude of response towards attitude statements in table -2 and 3.

It could be seen clearly from the table-2 that majority of the FFS trained respondents have strongly agreed (58.57 %) to the statement `the training in Farmers Field Schools is need based, field oriented and participatory and it proves effective' while 13.57 per cent strongly disagreed, undecided (11.43 %), agreed (10.71 %) and disagreed (5.71 %). Conversely majority of the untrained respondent's undecided (71.43 %) followed by strongly disagreed (17.14 %), strongly agreed (7.14 %), disagreed (2.86 %) and agreed (1.43 %). Majority (33.57 %) of the respondents showed strong agreement for the statement `IPM technologies are promoted through Farmers Field Schools followed by 30.00 per cent of the respondent's undecided followed by 21.43 per cent, 12.14 per cent and 2.86 per cent have agreed, strongly disagree and disagreement respectively. On the contrary, majority (70.00 %) of the untrained respondents disagreed followed by strongly disagree (21.43 %), agreed (7.14 %) and undecided (1.43 %). About 30.00 per cent of the trained respondents have strongly agreed to the statement `sustainable agricultural development approaches are taught in Farmers Field Schools'. Followed by one-fourth of the respondent's undecided, disagreed (19.29 %), an equal per cent (12.86 %) have agreed and strongly disagreed. On the other hand, majority (62.86 %) disagreed with the statement among the untrained respondents followed by strongly disagree (21.43 %), strongly agree (10.00 %), 2.86% with agreed and undecided respectively. Nearly half of the trained respondents (47.86 %) strongly agreed with the statement Farmers Field Schools programme is making commendable job to increase agricultural production in the area followed by agree (18.57 %), undecided (14.29 %), strongly disagree (11.43 %), and disagree (7.86 %). On the other hand, majority (58.57 %) of the respondents have agreed to the statement following by 17.14 per cent, 11.43 per cent, 10.00 per cent and 2.86 per cent strongly disagreed, strongly agreed, undecided and disagreed, respectively.

Among the trained respondents, 37.14 per cent, 27.14 per cent, 18.57 per cent, 10.71` per cent and 6.43 per cent strongly agreed, agreed, strongly disagreed, undecided and disagreed to the statement `Farmers Field Schools helped the farmers in reducing the risk and uncertainty in adopting the new practices', whereas, in case of untrained respondents 35.71 per cent disagreed with the statement, followed by 27.14 per cent, 18.57 per cent, 11.43 per cent and 7.14 per cent agreed, strongly disagreed, disagreed and undecided to the statement, respectively. Among the trained respondents 40.71 per cent agreed with the statement `Farmers Field Schools keep the farmers abreast of the latest agricultural technologies', followed by 20.00 per cent, 15.00 per cent, 12.86 per cent and 11.43 per cent strongly disagreed, strongly agreed, disagreed and undecided, respectively. In contrast, majority (45.71) of the untrained respondents agreed with the statement followed by strongly agreed (22.86 %), strongly disagreed (21.43 %), disagreed (8.57 %) and undecided (1.43 %).

A majority (48.57 %) of the trained respondents disagreed with the negative statement that `Farmers Field Schools mainly concentrating to develop big and affluent farmers followed by strongly agreed (21.43 %), disagreed (13.57 %), undecided (12.86 %) and agreed (3.57 %). But a cursory analysis of untrained respondents revealed that 51.43 per cent of the respondents agreed with the statement followed by strongly agreed (42.86 %), 2.86 per cent undecided and disagreed with the statement, respectively. A mixed response was observed among the trained respondents that 29.29 per cent undecided with statement that `quality of the produce could be improved due to adoption of learnt IPM practices through Farmers Held Schools followed by strongly disagree, strongly agree, agree and disagree with 24.29 per cent, 23.53 per cent, 15.00 per cent and 7.86 per cent, respectively. On the other hand, majorities (54.29 %) of the untrained respondents have undecided with the statement followed by strongly disagree (22.86 %), agreed (14.29 %), strongly agreed (7.14 %) and disagreed (1.43 %). Nearly half of the trained respondents strongly agreed towards the statement `farmers prefer IPM due to efficient pest management though it is complex' followed by strongly disagree (15.71 %), agreed (14.29 %), disagreed (13.57 %) and undecided (7.14 %). A critical analysis untrained respondents showed that vast majority (70.00 %), undecided towards the statement,

followed by 22.86 per cent, 4.29 per cent and 1.43 per cent and 1.43 per cent strongly disagree, strongly agree, agreed and disagreed, respectively.

About 25.71 per cent of the trained respondents strongly agreed towards the statement that `IPM encourages for regular scouting which helps to know the pest and disease' followed by disagree (22.14 %), strongly disagree (21.43 %), agree (16.43 %) and undeveloped (14.29 %). On the other hand, 74.29 per cent of untrained respondent's undecided towards the statement followed by strongly disagree (17.14 %), strongly agreed (4.29 %), disagree (2.88 %) and agreed (1.43 %). 48.57 per cent of the trained respondents strongly agreed towards the statement that `IPM approaches helps to maintaining safe ecosystem' followed by agreed (27.14 %), undecided (18.57 %), strongly disagree (3.57 %) and disagree (2.14 %). On the contrary, 72.86 per cent of the untrained respondent's undecided towards the statement followed by strongly disagree (24.29 %), strongly agree (1.43 %) and agree (1.43 %). Majority (44.29 %) of the trained respondents have strongly disagreed towards the negative statement that `it is not possible to control the defoliators by shaking the seedling with rope' followed by strongly agree (25.00 %), undecided (13.57 %), disagree (12.86 %) and agree (4.29 %). While 70.00 per cent of the untrained respondent's undecided with the statement followed by strongly agree (27.14 %), agree (1.43 %) and strongly disagree (1.43 %). 53.57 per cent of the trained respondents strongly agreed to the statement that `use of pheromone traps attract only some pests followed by strongly disagree (19.29 %), undecided (12.14 %), agree (8.57 %) and disagree (6.43 %). On the other hand, majority (62.86 %) of the untrained respondents undecided with the statement followed by strongly disagree (35.71 %) and disagree (1.43 %). 34.29 per cent of the trained respondents strongly disagree towards the negative statement that `IPM technology is not suitable for modern agriculture in the wake of WTO', followed by disagree (22.86 %), strongly agree (20.71 %), undecided (15.71 %) and agree (6.43 %). Whereas in case of untrained respondents 72.86 per cent undecided with the statement followed by strongly agree (22.85 %) and strongly disagree (4.29 %). Among the trained respondents 27.14 per cent undecided towards the negative statement that `IPM can be adopted only by farmers who underwent training in IPM' followed by strongly agree (25.00 %) strongly disagree (20.71 %), disagree (15.00 %) and agree (12.14 %). But a cursory analysis of untrained respondents indicated that 71.43 per cent of the respondent's undecided with the statement followed by strongly agree (22.86 %) and strongly disagree (5.71 %).

A mixed response was observed among the trained respondents that 28.57 per cent strongly agree with the statement that `one will acquire more knowledge about efficient crop management practices by adopting IPM' followed by strongly disagree (27.86 %), disagree (18.57 %), agree (13.57 %) and undecided (11.43 %). On the other hand, majority (78.57 %) of the untrained respondents were undecided with the statement followed by strongly disagree (20.00 %) and disagree (1.43 %). 35.00 per cent of the trained respondents strongly disagree towards the statement that `there is no device available to monitor disease incidence at farmers level' followed by strongly agree (29.29 %), agree (13.57 %), undecided (12.14 %) and disagree (10.00 %). On the other hand, 57.14 per cent of the untrained respondents strongly agree towards the statement followed by strongly disagree (21.42 %), agree (20.00 %) and disagree (1.43 %).

About 30.00 per cent of the trained respondents strongly disagree towards the negative statement that `chemical seed treatment before sowing is a just a waste of money and time for farmers followed by strongly agree (25.00 %), disagree (17.14 %), undecided (14.29 %) and agree (13.57 %). On the contrary 57.14 per cent of the untrained respondent's undecided towards the statement followed by disagree (22.86 %), strongly agree (18.57 %) and strongly disagree (1.43 %). Majority (41.43 %) of the trained respondents have strongly agreed towards the statement that `IPM practices gives good income compared to traditional method of plant protection' followed by strongly disagree (22.86 %), agree (22.14 %), undecided (7.86 %) and disagree (5.71 %). While 42.86 per cent of the untrained respondents have strongly agreed with the statement followed by agree (38.57 %) and strongly disagree (18.57 %). 34.29 per cent of the trained respondents have strongly disagreed to the negative statement that `environment hazards resulting from IPM is more' followed by agree (23.57 %), disagree (22.14 %), strongly agree (15.71 %) and undecided (4.29 %). On the other hand, majority (75.71 %) of the untrained respondents undecided with the statement followed by strongly agree (22.86 %) and strongly disagree (1.43 %). 29.28 per cent of the trained respondents strongly disagreed to the negative statement that `IPM requires community cooperation which is difficult to attain' followed by strongly disagree (27.86 %), undecided (20.71 %), strongly agree (15.71 %) and agree (7.14 %). On the other hand, majority (74.27 %) of the untrained respondent's undecided with the statement followed strongly agrees (22.86 %) and strongly disagree (2.86 %).

About 37.14 per cent of the trained respondents strongly agreed to the statement that `need based use

of insecticides on the basis of pest defender ratio is definitely beneficial' followed by strongly disagree (20.71 %), agree (20.71 %), undecided (10.71 %) and disagree (10.71 %). Whereas, in case of untrained respondents 82.86 per cent undecided with the statement followed by strongly disagree (17.14 %). 30.71 per cent of the trained respondent's undecided towards the negative statement that `illiterate farmers face problems in practicing IPM' followed disagree (26.43 %), strongly disagree (25.00 %), strongly agree (11.43 %) and agree (6.43 %). Whereas in case of untrained respondents 77.14 per cent of the respondents agreed with the statement followed by strongly agree (18.57 %) and strongly disagree (4.29 %). Majority (60.00 %) of the trained respondents strongly disagreed towards the negative statement that `IPM is not useful in reducing environmental pollution' followed by undecided (13.57 %), disagree (12.86 %), strongly agree (10.71 %) and agree (2.86 %). But a cursory analysis of untrained respondents revealed that 57.14 per cent of the respondents' undecided with the statement followed by disagree (20.00 %), strongly agree (18.57 %), and strongly disagree (4.29 %). About 40.00 per cent of the trained respondents strongly disagree towards the negative statement that `IPM is difficult to practice' followed by disagree (32.14 %), undecided (12.14 %), strongly agree (10.00 %), and agree (5.71 %). On the other hand, 54.29 per cent of the untrained respondents agreed with the statement followed by undecided (28.57 %), strongly agree (14.29 %) and strongly disagree (2.86 %).

Table 2: Response Analysis of Attitude Statements of Trained Respondents (n=140)

S. No	Statement/ Item	SA		A		UD		DA		SDA	
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
1	The training in Farmers Field Schools is need-based field oriented and participatory and hence it proves effective.	82	58.57	15	10.71	16	11.43	8	5.71	19	13.57
2	IPM technologies are promoted through Farmers Field Schools.	47	33.57	30	21.43	42	30.00	4	2.86	17	12.14
3	Sustainable Agricultural developments approaches are taught in Farmers Field Schools	41	29.29	18	12.86	36	25.71	27	19.29	18	12.86
4	Farmers Field School programme is making commendable job to increase agricultural production in the area.	67	47.86	26	18.57	20	14.29	11	7.86	16	11.43
5	The Farmers Field Schools helped the farmers in reducing the risk and uncertainty in adopting new practices.	52	37.14	38	27.14	15	10.71	9	6.43	26	18.57
6	Farmers Field Schools keep the farmers abreast of the latest agricultural technologies.	57	40.71	21	15.00	16	11.43	18	12.86	28	20.00
7	Farmers Field Schools are mainly concentrating to develop big and affluent farmers of the area.	30	21.43	5	3.57	18	12.86	19	13.57	68	48.57
8	Quality of the produce could be improved due to adoption of IPM practices learned through Farmers Field Schools.	33	23.57	21	15.00	41	29.29	11	7.86	34	24.29
9	Farmers prefer IPM due to efficient pest management though it is complex.	69	49.29	20	14.29	10	7.14	19	13.57	22	15.71
10	IPM encourages for regular scouting, which helps to know the pest and disease.	36	25.71	23	16.43	20	14.29	30	21.43	31	22.14

S. No	Statement/ Item	SA		A		UD		DA		SDA	
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
11	IPM approach helps to maintaining the safe ecosystem	68	48.57	38	27.14	26	18.57	3	2.14	5	3.57
12	It is not possible to control the defoliator by shaking the seedling with rope.	35	25.00	6	4.29	19	13.57	18	12.86	62	44.29
13	Use of pheromone traps attracts only some pests	75	53.57	12	8.57	17	12.14	9	6.43	27	19.29
14	IPM technology is not suitable for modern agriculture in the wake of WTO	29	20.71	9	6.43	22	15.71	32	22.86	48	34.29
15	IPM can be adopted only by farmers who under went training in IPM	35	25.00	17	12.14	38	27.14	21	15.00	29	20.71
16	One will acquire more knowledge about efficient crop management practices by adopting IPM	40	28.57	19	13.57	16	11.43	26	18.57	39	27.86
17	There is no device available to monitor disease incidence at farmers level	41	29.29	19	13.57	17	12.14	14	10.00	49	35.00
18	Chemical seed treatment before sowing is a just, a waste of money and time for farmers.	35	25.00	19	13.57	20	14.29	24	17.14	42	30.00
19	IPM practices gives good income compared to traditional method of plant protection.	58	41.43	31	22.14	11	7.86	8	5.71	32	22.86
20	Environment hazards resulting from IPM is more.	22	15.71	33	23.57	6	4.29	31	22.14	48	34.29
21	IPM requires community cooperation, which is difficult to attain.	21	15.00	10	7.14	29	20.71	41	29.29	39	27.86
22	Need based use of insecticides on the basis of pest defender ratio is definitely beneficial.	52	37.14	29	20.71	15	10.71	15	10.71	29	20.71
23	Illiterate farmers face difficulties in practicing IPM	16	11.43	9	6.43	43	30.71	37	26.43	35	25.00
24	IPM is not useful in reducing environmental pollution	15	10.71	4	2.86	19	13.57	18	12.86	84	60.00
25	IPM is difficult to practice	14	10.00	8	5.71	17	12.14	45	32.14	56	40.00

Table 3: Response Analysis of Attitude Statements of Untrained Respondents (n=70)

S. No	Statement/ Item	SA		A		UD		DA		SDA	
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
1	The training in Farmers Field Schools is need-based field oriented and participatory and hence it proves effective.	5	7.14	1	1.43	50	71.43	2	2.86	12	17.14
2	IPM technologies are promoted through Farmers Field Schools.	0	0.00	5	7.14	1	1.43	49	70.00	15	21.43
3	Sustainable Agricultural developments approaches are taught in Farmers Field Schools	7	10.00	2	2.86	2	2.86	44	62.86	15	21.43
4	Farmers Field School programme is making	8	11.43	41	58.57	7	10.00	2	2.86	12	17.14

S. No	Statement/ Item	SA		A		UD		DA		SDA	
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
	commendable job to increase agricultural production in the area.										
5	The Farmers Field Schools helped the farmers in reducing the risk and uncertainty in adopting new practices.	25	35.71	19	27.14	5	7.14	8	11.43	13	18.57
6	Farmers Field Schools keep the farmers abreast of the latest agricultural technologies.	16	22.86	32	45.71	1	1.43	6	8.57	15	21.43
7	Farmers Field Schools are mainly concentrating to develop big and affluent farmers of the area.	30	42.86	36	51.43	2	2.86	0	0.00	2	2.86
8	Quality of the produce could be improved due to adoption of IPM practices learned through Farmers Field Schools.	5	7.14	10	14.29	38	54.29	1	1.43	16	22.86
9	Farmers prefer IPM due to efficient pest management though it is complex.	3	4.29	1	1.43	49	70.00	1	1.43	16	22.86
10	IPM encourages for regular scouting, which helps to know the pest and disease.	3	4.29	1	1.43	52	74.29	2	2.86	12	17.14
11	IPM approach helps to maintaining the safe ecosystem	1	1.43	1	1.43	51	72.86	0	0.00	17	24.29
12	It is not possible to control the defoliator by shaking the seedling with rope.	19	27.14	1	1.43	49	70.00	0	0.00	1	1.43
13	Use of pheromone traps attracts only some pests	0	0.00	0	0.00	44	62.86	1	1.43	25	35.71
14	IPM technology is not suitable for modern agriculture in the wake of WTO	16	22.86	0	0.00	51	72.86	0	0.00	3	4.29
15	IPM can be adopted only by farmers who under went training in IPM	16	22.86	0	0.00	50	71.43	0	0.00	4	5.71
16	One will acquire more knowledge about efficient crop management practices by adopting IPM	0	0.00	0	0.00	55	78.57	1	1.43	14	20.00
17	There is no device available to monitor disease incidence at farmers level	40	57.14	14	20.00	0	0.00	1	1.43	15	21.43
18	Chemical seed treatment before sowing is a just, a waste of money and time for farmers.	13	18.57	0	0.00	40	57.14	16	22.86	1	1.43
19	IPM practices gives good income compared to traditional method of plant protection.	30	42.86	27	38.57	0	0.00	0	0.00	13	18.57
20	Environment hazards resulting from IPM is more.	16	22.86	0	0.00	53	75.71	0	0.00	1	1.43
21	IPM requires community cooperation, which is difficult to attain.	16	22.86	0	0.00	52	74.29	0	0.00	2	2.86

S. No	Statement/ Item	SA		A		UD		DA		SDA	
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
22	Need based use of insecticides on the basis of pest defender ratio is definitely beneficial.	0	0.00	0	0.00	58	82.86	0	0.00	12	17.14
23	Illiterate farmers face difficulties in practicing IPM	13	18.57	54	77.14	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	4.29
24	IPM is not useful in reducing environmental pollution	13	18.57	0	0.00	40	57.14	14	20.00	3	4.29
25	IPM is difficult to practice	10	14.29	38	54.29	20	28.57	0	0.00	2	2.86

A bird's eye view of the table -2 and 3 reveals that majority of the FFS trained respondents had moderately favourable attitude towards FFS with special emphasis on IPM practices and untrained respondents had less favourable attitude. Since, the FFS programme has been started eight years ago it clearly explains the moderately favourable attitude towards FFS and it can be attributed that the favourable attitude of the farmers has a bearing on the less favourable attitude of the untrained farmers.

It could be explained that the increased awareness, knowledge gained in the FFS programme has contributed a lot on the economic and management orientation, medium level of mass media exposure, medium level of social participation has contributed to the moderately favourable attitude of the trained respondents. The results clearly explains that the extension agencies (Department of Agriculture) should given more emphasis on training the farmers regarding the IPM practices and adopting the same for enhanced and less chemical residues of the produce.

Since, the produce is much sold in the market when it is free from chemical residues. For this the extension agency had to take much interest in conducting training programmes, demonstrations and especially field tours make the farmers to change their less favourable attitude to more favourable attitude. Further, the results clearly indicated that the untrained respondents have less favourable attitude due to the lack of knowledge and awareness on the IPM practices. So, extension agencies have to give much focus in identifying untrained respondents to change their attitude.

The calculated 'z' value was compared with the table value. It resulted in rejection of null hypothesis as the calculated value was significant at 0.01 per cent level of probability. This indicated that there was significant difference between FFS trained and untrained farmers in respect of attitude with special emphasis on IPM practices. Further, when the means are compared between FFS trained and untrained farmers it is evident that the mean attitude scores of FFS trained (68.29) were higher to that of untrained (29.34) indicating that the FFS trained farmers had higher level of attitude than untrained respondents in respect of IPM in rice.

Difference in Attitude Scores of FFS Trained and Untrained Respondents:

Table 4: Difference in Attitude Scores of FFS Trained and Untrained Respondents

S. No	Category	Mean	S.D.	'Z' value
1.	FFS Trained	68.29	23.80	266.07 **
2.	FFS Untrained	29.34	10.17	

'Z' – critical value significant at 0.01 probability level.

In order to find out the significant difference if any between the attitudes of FFS trained and untrained farmers on IPM, the mean attitude scores were subject to 'z' test `and the results are presented in table 28.

Null hypothesis: There will be no significant difference between the mean attitude scores of FFS trained and untrained farmers of IPM in rice.

Empirical hypothesis: There is a significant difference between the mean attitude scores of FFS trained and untrained farmers of IPM in rice.

The calculated 'z' value was compared with the table value. It resulted in rejection of null hypothesis as the calculated value was significant at 0.01 per cent level of probability. This indicated that there was significant difference between FFS trained and untrained farmers in respect of attitude with special emphasis on IPM practices. Further, when the means are compared between FFS trained and untrained farmers it is evident that the mean attitude scores of FFS trained (68.29) were higher to that of untrained (29.34) indicating that the FFS trained farmers had

higher level of attitude than untrained respondents in respect of IPM in rice.

Conclusion: The study pointed that majority of FFS trained farmers had moderately favourable attitude towards IPM. Hence, there is a need on the part of the authorities concerned with FFS programme to educate and motivate the farmers about the benefits of IPM technology through exposure visits to the success cases which in turn will help in developing more favourable attitude.

References:

1. Manoj, A. 2013. Impact of Farmers' Field Schools on farmers' knowledge, productivity and environment. PhD Thesis submitted to Indian Agricultural Research Institute, New Delhi.
2. Neha, S. 2013. Impact of Farmer's Field School Training Programme on Adoption of Integrated Pest Management practices in Rice by the farmers of the Korba District of Chhattisgarh. M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis submitted to Indira Gandhi Krishi Vishwa Vidyalaya, Raipur (C.G).

***

K. Atchuta Raju
Scientist (TOT), DAATTC (ANGRAU), Machilipatnam, A. P,
K. Vijaya Prakash
SMS (Vety.Extn.), KVK, Garikapadu-522614, A.P.