

Evaluation of yield performance of gram (*cicer ARIETINUM*) through front line demonstration

JAGANNATH PATHAK

ICAR-AICRP (MSPE), Department of Botany, University of Lucknow, Lucknow, UP, 226007

Email: jagannathpathak@yahoo.in

Abstract

Burhanpur comes under Nimar region of Madhya Pradesh and agriculturally it is very important district. In Burhanpur chickpea cultivation is very common but its productivity is very low. To establish the production potential of crop Front Line Demonstrations (FLDs) is an appropriate tool. To increase the production and productivity of gram in the district, Krishi Vigyan Kendra, Burhanpur conducted 75 demonstrations on gram during 2010 to 2012 in four adopted villages. The critical inputs were identified in existing production technology through farmers meeting and group discussions with the farmers. Average yield data of conducted FLDs revealed that, higher yield (1767 kg ha⁻¹) was obtained in demo plot over local check (1364 kg ha⁻¹) and additional yield in demo plot was obtained 403 kg. Percent increase over local check was found 29.54%. Average extension gap, technology gap and technology index were found 402.33, 433.33 kg ha⁻¹ and 19.69% respectively. Averages of gross and net returns of demonstration were 29.17 and 42.69% higher than the farmers' practice respectively. Most important factor B:C ratio indicates that whether FLD technology is profitable or not. B:C ratio was found higher throughout the study and average was (3.10) in demonstration over local check (2.58). Review of data on incidence of disease in crop revealed that, percentage of damaged plant (9.83) was lower in demonstration as compared to (17.10) under farmers' practice. Spraying of propenophos 50 EC at the pod initiation stage reduces pod borer attack, consequently lesser infected pods (2.37) in demo as compared to farmers' practices (7.9). Result suggested economic viability and agronomic feasibility of the FLD technology for gram cultivation.

Key Words: Font Line Demonstration (FLD), Intervention, Technology, Yield

Introduction

The per capita net availability per day of pulses is still low in India, ranging from 42-47 gram. It is almost stagnating with slight increase in recent years. This is due to the increase in population and almost stagnation in production of pulses. Despite the spiraling prices of pulses, the area and production of pulses has not changed much during the last many years. Area under pulses ranged between 23 - 25 million hectares and production 15- 19 million tonnes in India. The current productivity of pulses varied from 700-790 kg/ha. Although there is slight increase in pulse productivity in recent times, but it is still well below the world's average productivity (840 kg/ha). Interestingly India is the largest producer, importer and consumer of Pulses in the world. Pulses occupy a prominent place

in human nutrition particularly among the lower - income groups of people in developing countries like India. Important pulses grown in India are chick pea (bengal gram), pigeon pea (red gram), lentil (masur), urd bean (black gram), mung bean (green gram), moth bean, pea, grass pea (khesari), cow pea (lobia) and broad bean (faba bean), etc. These grains are relatively inexpensive source of protein in developing countries where protein energy malnutrition is quite common. The protein content in pulse grains generally ranges from 20-25%. Besides protein, pulses are also a good source of dietary fibre, starch, minerals and vitamins. Legumes are typically low in fat, contain no cholesterol, and are high in folate, potassium, iron and magnesium. A good source of protein, legumes can be a healthy

substitute for meat, which has more fat and cholesterol. Legumes are included in all 'food baskets' and dietary guidelines. The World Food Programme (WFP) for instance includes 60 grams of pulses in its typical food basket, alongside cereals, oils, sugar and salts. Encouraging awareness of the nutritional value of legumes can help consumers adopt healthier diets. Legumes are an important component of crop rotations, they require less fertilizer than other crops and they are a low carbon source of protein. They have a direct positive impact on soil quality because they help feed soil microbes, which helps in improving soil health. They have also been shown to produce greater amounts of different amino acids than non legumes and its plant residues have a different biochemical composition than other crop residues. There are many legumes traditionally used as dal and many of them now being utilized as vegetables. There are several reasons responsible for declining the productivity of pulses is; more focus on cereal crops e.g. wheat & rice, less investment on irrigation facilities (only 15% for pulses as against 80-90% for wheat/ rice), technological absence to minimize disease, insect and weed infestation, that caused substantial damage (30%) in standing crops, green revolution just by passed the pulses and hence the use of HYVs for pulses was never encouraged, lack of quality seed of improved varieties, cultivation on less fertile soil, rainfed and marginal lands, imbalance use of nutrient, lack of integration of nutrient supply sources and adverse impact of weather aberrations on crops.

In general the productivity of gram crop in Burhanpur is low because of least technological backup, small and marginal land holdings and poor adoption of improved package of practices. Therefore, efforts have been made through Front Line Demonstrations (FLDs) to introduce innovative package of practices of gram with a view to increase its productivity in the district. So, the present investigation has been undertaken with following objectives.

1. To evaluate the impact of Front Line Demonstration on yield enhancement of gram.
2. To investigate the impact of Front Line Demonstration on technology adoption.
3. To find out the role of technology in minimising the disease and insect infestation.

Methodology

Study was carried out by Krishi Vigyan Kendra and 75 demonstrations were conducted in its adopted

villages viz. Dhoolkot, Harda, Sandas and Umarda of Burhanpur district of MP in rabi season of 2010, 2011 and 2012 on the selected farmers' fields. Each demo was conducted in 0.4 ha (one acre) and thus, 25 demonstrations were conducted every year. For the adoption of village PRA technique and for the selection of farmers the purposive sampling design from frequently organized group meetings was exercised in each village. Before conducting FLDs, a list of sample farmers was prepared. Package of practices (POP) oriented training to be imparted to the selected farmers (Venkattakumar *et.al.* 2010). During meeting, receptive and innovative farmers were selected for technological intervention. Improved technology released from JNKVV Jabalpur was adopted, which was comprised of soil test based fertilizers tailoring (20:60:20:20 kg NPKS ha⁻¹), seed treatment (thirum 2 g + carbendazim 1g kg⁻¹ seed followed by *Bradyrhizobium japonicum* and PSB culture @ 5 g kg⁻¹ seed), soils treatment (*Trichoderma viridie* culture @ 10 kg ha⁻¹), Disease resistant variety JG 130, Seed (@100 kg ha⁻¹), sowing time (first fort night of October), sowing by bullock drawn plough, sowing distance (45 cm R to R), weed management, harvesting (between last week of March to first week of April).

In general the soil in which FLDs were conducted having P^H range of 7.32-8.12, EC 0.4-0.7 dSm⁻¹, organic carbon, phosphorus and potassium whose ranges were 0.45-0.69, 12-21 and >280 kg ha⁻¹ respectively. Soils come under vertisols soil order and defined as medium deep black soils. Vertisols soils have swelling and shrinking properties with good water holding capacity.

The performance of demonstrated technology was compared with farmers practice in the same villages. Farmers' practice included imbalance use of fertilizers i.e. 18:46:0:0 kg NPKS ha⁻¹, higher seed rate (110-120 kg ha⁻¹) and indiscriminate use of pesticides. The differences in between demonstrated technology and existing farmers' practices (local check) are mentioned in table 1.

To study the yield attributes, 25 plants were selected by randomly placing of quadrat at five places in demo plots as well as in FPs plots and five plants selected from each quadrat. Yield data from demonstration and FPs' were collected after harvesting the crop. For the recording of seed index 100 seeds were taken and weighed. Economical assessment was done as per prevailing market prices.

Table 1: Comparison between technological intervention and local check under FLDs on gram

S.No.	Particulars	Technological Intervention (Demonstration)	Farmers' Practice (Local Check)	Technological Gap
1.	Farming situation	Irrigated	Irrigated	No gap
2.	Variety	JG-130	Unidentified	Full gap (100%)
3.	Land preparation	Summer deep ploughing followed by rotavator	Summer deep ploughing followed by rotavator	No gap
4.	Time of sowing	first fortnight of October	first fortnight of October	No gap
5.	Seed treatment	Thirum 2g + Carbendazim 1gkg ⁻¹ seed +Bio-fertilizers	No seed treatment	Full gap (100%)
6.	Seed rate	100 kg ha ⁻¹	110-120kg ha ⁻¹	10-20% more than recommendation
7.	Method of sowing	Line sowing	Line sowing	No gap
8.	Nutrients application	20:60:20:20 kg NPKS ha ⁻¹	18:46:0:0 kg NPKS ha ⁻¹	Not as per recommendation
9.	Weed management	Manual weeding	Manual weeding	No gap
10.	Pod borer control	Applied propenophos 50 EC @ 2.5 ml/liter water	Use of indiscriminate and non recommended insecticides	Full gap (100%)

Data were collected from both demos as well as farmers' practice plots and analyzed for the yield gap, yield index (Samui *et al.* 2003).

Results and Discussion

Yield:

Implementation of improved production technology remarkably increased the yield (25.67-33.30 %) over farmers' practice during the three year of demonstration. The average yield under recommended practice was achieved 1767kg ha⁻¹ as compared to the farmers' practice 1364 kg ha⁻¹ which was 29.54 % higher (table-2). Although yield obtained under demo plots was lower than the potential yield of variety. It may be due to cumulative effect of several biotic and abiotic factors in micro climatic conditions that varying year to year.

Yield enhancement under recommended practice might be due to balance nutrition as per soil test value, integrated approach, involving fertilizers and bio-fertilizers which play a vital role in making availability of plant nutrients. Similar results were observed by Tomar *et al.* (2003), Tiwari and Saxena (2001) and Tiwari *et al.* (2003).

Data presented in table 2 revealed that demonstrated technology had impact over farmers' practices. It might be due to cumulative effect of yield attributes and seed index. The yield increased in demonstrated field due to technological intervention may happen in other similar situation. The results are in agreement with the findings as reported by Tomar *et al.* (2003).

Table 2: Performance of technological intervention (FLDs) on yield and yield attributes of gram

Year	Variety	Yield potential (kg/ha ⁻¹)	Plant Population (No/M ²)		Seed yield (kg/ha ⁻¹)		Seed index (g/100 seeds)		% increase over control (FP)
			RP	FP	RP	FP	RP	FP	
2010-11	JG130	2200	45	39	1773	1330	55.2	54.4	33.30
2011-12	JG130	2200	48	41	1779	1372	55.7	54.2	29.66
2012-13	JG130	2200	47	42	1748	1391	56.0	54.6	25.67
Average	-	2200	46.67	40.67	1767	1364	55.63	54.4	29.54

RP: Recommended Practice

FP: Farmers Practice

Table 3: Economical comparison between recommended practice and farmers practice

Year	Gross cost (Rs. ha ⁻¹)		Gross return (Rs. ha ⁻¹)		Net return (Rs. ha ⁻¹)		B: C Ratio	
	RP	FP	RP	FP	RP	FP	RP	FP
2010-11	14592	13587	35476	26533	20884	12973	2.43	1.95
2011-12	15210	14125	56933	43933	41723	29808	3.74	3.11
2012-13	15560	14475	48952	38972	33392	24497	3.14	2.69
Average	15121	14062	47120	36479	32000	22426	3.10	2.58

Table 4: Impact of technological intervention on pest infestation

Year	Disease affected plants M ⁻²		Damage %		Infected pods (No/plant)	
	RP	FP	RP	FP	RP	FP
2010-11	4.2	6.3	9.33	16.15	1.2	7.8
2011-12	4.6	7.1	9.58	17.31	3.3	9.2
2012-13	5.1	7.5	10.58	17.85	2.6	6.7
Average	4.63	6.97	9.83	17.10	2.37	7.9

Economical Assessment:

The cost of cultivation in demonstration was comparatively higher (Rs. 14592-15560) as compared to farmers' practice (Rs. 13587 - 14475) because of additional input applied in demonstration. The gross return (Rs.36479) and net returns (Rs.22426) in farmer practice were lower than the gross return (Rs. 47120) and net returns (Rs. 32000) of demonstration. Average of gross and net returns of demonstration was 29.17% and 42.69% higher than that of farmers' practice respectively. It showed that the adoption of demonstrated technology by the farmers would be economically gainful proposition.

The B:C ratio exhibited the same trend as in gross and net returns which was found 2.43 - 3.74 in demonstration and 1.95 - 3.11 in farmers' practice (table 3). Year to year ups and downs in cost of cultivation, which consequently reflected the benefits were on account of variability in cost of inputs and outputs. Results suggested economic viability and agronomic feasibility of the technology for gram cultivation. These results are in conformity of the results as reported by Deshmukh *et al.* (2005).

Disease incidence:

Data recorded on plants infested with wilt (*Fusarium* wilt) caused by *Fusarium oxysporum* f.sp. ciceris revealed that, incidence of disease was lower in demonstration plot as compared to farmers' practice. It was observed that on an average only 4.63 plants M⁻² showed wilting symptoms in demonstration

as compared to 6.97 (average) plants M⁻² in farmers' practice. Data presented in table 4 reflected that the percentage of damaged plant (9.83) was lower in demonstration as compared to farmers' practice (17.10). This could be ascribed due to seed treatment. The findings are in line with the results reported by Chand and Khirbat (2009) and Nene *et al.* (1978).

Insect infestation:

During the study, data as recorded (table 4) on infestation of pod borer (*Helicoverpa armigera*) caused premature dry and shading of pods. Spraying of propenophos 50 EC @ 2.5 ml/liter water at the time of pod initiation caused lesser pods infected (2.37) as compared to farmers' practices (7.9). Similar results quoted by Hossain *et al.* (2010).

Extension gap, technology gap and yield index:

Data presented in table 5 showed the variation in extension gap and it varied from 357 -443 kg ha⁻¹ with its averaged 402.33 kg ha⁻¹. Variations in technology gap (421 – 452 kg ha⁻¹) reflected the impact of recommended technology used in front line demonstrations in subsequent years. Fluctuations in technology gap as observed may be due to several biotic and abiotic factors. These results are in close conformity with the findings of Mitra and Samajdar (2010).

Yield index showed the feasibility of the evolved technology at the farmers' fields. Lower value of yield index meant more feasibility of disseminated technology (inverse relations). Variations in technology index

Table 5: Impact of FLDs on Extension, technology gap and yield index

Year	Extension gap (kg ha ⁻¹)	Technology gap (kg ha ⁻¹)	Technology index (%)
2010-11	443	427	19.40
2011-12	407	421	19.13
2012-13	357	452	20.54
Average	402.33	433.33	19.69

during the FLDs were found 19.13 - 20.54 % however; its average of three year was 19.69% (table 5). Variations in yield index may be due to variations in soil fertility, environmental hazards and infestation of pest. The reduction in yield index (19.13) is good indicator of increased feasibility of demonstrated technology in these demonstrations and it can be gainful proposition for the farmers of the district and region as well. The results corroborated with the findings reported by Sagar and Chandra (2004).

References

- Chand, H. and Khirbat, S.K. (2009). Chickpea wilt and its management - a review. *Agric. Rev.*, 30 (1):1-12.
- Deshmukh, K. K., Saraiya, A.B. and Dubey, D.P. (2005). Effect of integrated nutrient management on productivity trends, economics and soil fertility in soybean-chickpea cropping system. *JNKVV Res. J.* 39(2): 29-32.
- Hossain Altaf, Haque Azizul, Ahmad Masum and Prodhan M.Z.H. (2010). Development of an integrated management approach for pod borer, *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hubner) on chickpea. *Bangladesh J. Agril. Res.* 35(2): 201-206.
- Mitra Biplab, and Samajdar, T. (2010). Yield gap analysis of rapeseed- mustard through FLD. *Agricultural Extension Review, April-June.*, 16-17.
- Nene, Y.L., Mengistu A., Sinclair, J.B. and Royse, D.J. (1978). An annotated bibliography of chickpea diseases, *Information bulletin No.1*. PP 1-53.
- Sagar, R., L. and Ganesh, Chandra (2004). Front line demonstration on sesame in West Bengal. *Agricultural Extension Review*, 16 (2): 7-10.
- Samui, S., K. Maitra, S., Roy, D., K. Mandal, A., K. and Saha, D. (2003). Evaluation of front line demonstration on ground nut. *Journal of the Indian Society Coastal Agricultural Research*, 18 (2): 180-183.
- Tiwari, K., B. and Saxena, A. (2001). Economic analysis of FLD of oil seed in Chhindwara. *Bhartiya Krishi Anusandhan Patrika*, 16 (3 & 4): 185-189.
- Tiwari, R.B., Singh, Vinay and Parihar, Pushapa. (2003). Role of FLD in transfer of gram production technology. *Maharashtra J. of Ext.Edu.*, 22 (1): 19.
- Tomer, L.S., Sharma, B.P. and Joshi, K. (2003). Study on yield gap and adoption level of potato production technology in grid region. *Maharashtra J. of Ext. Edu.*, 22 (1): 15-18.
- Tomer, L.S., Sharma, B.P. and Joshi, K. (2003). Impact of front line demonstration of soybean in transfer of improved technology. *Journal of Ext.Edu.* .22 (1):139.
- Venkattakumar, R., Ramanarao, S.V., Padmaiah, M. and Madhuri, P. (2010). Production constraints and information needs growers in Andhra Pradesh. *Agri. Extn. Review, April- June*: pp 21-24.