Environment and Ecology 37 (3): 732–736, July–September 2019 Website: environmentandecology.com ISSN 0970-0420

# Impact of Cluster Front Line Demonstration on Oilseed Crops in Chatra District of Jharkhand

Ranjay Kumar Singh, Dharma Oraon, Kumar Priya Ranjan, U. K. Singh, Z. Alam, J. Oraon

Received 30 January 2019 ; Accepted 2 March 2019 ; Published on 23 March 2019

The study was conducted in 4 purpo-Abstract sively selected blocks (Chatra, Gidhour, Simariya, and Pratappur) in Chatra district of Jharkhand where Cluster Frontline Demonstration on oilseed conducted in the year 2016-17 and 2017-18. Covering two villages in each blocks i.e. 8 villages in the district. In demonstrating farmers, 150 numbered of farmers i.e. 30 farmers for each crops Sesame, Groundnut, Niger, Linseed and Mustard selected as a respondent in the study. The demonstration consisting of two treatments one is control (farmers practices) and another, demonstration of improved varieties with full recommended package of practices. The cluster front line demonstration (CFLD) was conducted in 233 farmers field in 2016-17 and 2017-18 respectively, covering 90 ha and 200 ha crops area of different oil seed crops, like Sesame, Groundnut, Niger, Linseed and Mustard respectively. The demonstration was conducted on randomized block design with 0.5 acre plot size for 1 deconstration. The productivity and economic return of Sesame, Groundnut, Niger, Linseed and Mustard in improved technologies were calculated and compared with the corresponding

Ranjay Kumar Singh<sup>1</sup>\*, Dharma Oraon<sup>2</sup>, U. K. Singh<sup>4</sup>, Z. Alam<sup>5</sup> Krishi Vigyan Kendra, Chatra, BAU, Ranchi (Jharkhand), India

Kumar Priya Ranjan<sup>3</sup> DNS, Regional Institute of Cooperative Management, Shastri Nagar, Patna 23, India

J. Oraon6

Director Extension Education, BAU, Ranchi, Jharkhand, India e-mail: kvkchatra2012@gmail.com \*Corresponding author farmers practices (Local checks). All oil seed crops recorded higher gross return, net return and benefit cost ratio in improved technologies as compared to the farmers practice. It is suggested that improved varieties and critical input like micro nutrient make available on local level, so that farmers get easily according to their needs, appropriate extension methodology for faster dissemination and diffusion of technologies in the district.

Keywords KVK, CFLD, *Kharif*, *Rabi*, Technology index.

### Introduction

Krishi Vigyan Kendra (KVKs) are the last mile public sector unit of frontline extension delivery mechanism at the district level established by ICAR. These agriculture science center to further technology dissemination under national agricultural research system (NARS) at the grass roots. The network of KVK works towards a common aim of conducting technology assessment, refinement and demonstration through various activities. The KVKs also play a critical role in knowledge, skill and technological empowerment of farmers based on their local needs challenges and requirement. The KVKs refine and spread agriculture technologies between farmers of the district to improved production and productivity as per the local needs. Oilseed crops is one of the important crops of the Jharkhand, it is grown in about 278.14 lakh ha area. It is also important crops of the Chatra District and it covers about 1,660 ha in kharif and 17,030 ha in rabi season. Oilseed crops is best

| Table 1. Area production and productivity of oilseed crops | cul- |
|--|------|
| tivated in the district 2017-18.                           |      |

| Crop      | Area<br>(ha) | Produc-<br>tion<br>(quin-<br>tals) | Produc-<br>tivity<br>(q/ha) |
|-----------|--------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Kharif    |              |                                    |                             |
| Sesame    | 326          | 834.56                             | 3.5                         |
| Groundnut | 370          | 3792.5                             | 9.8                         |
| Niger     | 172          | 1722.71                            | 3.25                        |
| Rabi      |              |                                    |                             |
| Linseed   | 1640         | 4920                               | 3.1                         |
| Mustard   | 12580        | 116365                             | 9.25                        |

suited to areas having low to moderate rainfall and mild cold weather.

Indian Government imports large quality of oilseed to fulfill domestic requirement. In this regards, to balance this production and consumption of edible oil, the department of agriculture, cooperation and farmers welfare government of India had sanctioned the project, Cluster Front Line Demonstration (CFLD) on oilseed in every KVKs of India. Similarly this project was implemented by KVK Chatra with objective to boost the production and productivity of oilseed through appropriate improved varieties and location specific tested technologies.

#### **Materials and Methods**

There are 3 major oilseed crops grown in the district in *kharif* and 2 in *rabi* season in Chatra District of Jharkhand.

Table 1 shows the area total production and productivity of oilseed crops in the district during 2017-18. The district, block and villages was purposively selected for the study because cluster front line demonstration (CFLD) conducted by the Krishi Vigyan Kendra to transfer improved production technologies in farmers field.

The data on production cost and monetary returns

 Table 2. Detail area coverage and number of farmers covered under Cluster Front Line Demonstration within two years under oil seed crops.

|                |   |   | 2016-17      |                        | 2017         | 2017-18                |              | Total               |  |
|----------------|---|---|--------------|------------------------|--------------|------------------------|--------------|---------------------|--|
| Crop           | Farmers practice  | Technology<br>demonstrated  | Area<br>(ha) | No. of<br>far-<br>mers | Area<br>(ha) | No. of<br>far-<br>mers | Area<br>(ha) | No.<br>far-<br>mers |  |
| Sesame         | Farmers variety<br>(Kala til) with<br>farmers man-<br>agement       | Improved variety (GT-2). $(N_{40}P_{40}K_{20})$ , line sowing   | 10           | 25                     | 10           | 15                     | 20           | 40                  |  |
| Ground-<br>nut | Farmers variety<br>() farmers<br>management                         | Improved variety (TG-37A) with $(N_{60}P_{40}K_{20})$ , and line sowing (30×10 cm)  | 20           | 35                     | 20           | 38                     | 40           | 73                  |  |
| Niger          | Farmers variety<br>(Kala Sarguja)<br>with farmers                   | Improved variety (JNC)-6 with $(N_{40}P_{40}K_{20})$ , and line sowing $(30 \times 15 \text{ cm})$                        | 30           | 58                     | 15           | 36                     | 45           | 94                  |  |
| Linseed        | management<br>Farmers variety<br>(Desi tisi) under<br>para cropping | Improved variety –She-<br>khar with seed treatment<br>with Carbendazim 50,<br>INM $(N_{30}P_{20}K_{20})$ kg/ha<br>and IPM | 20           | 55                     | 15           | 42                     | 35           | 97                  |  |
| Mustard        | Farmers variety<br>(Pila Rai) local<br>varieties under              | Improved variety–PM-30)<br>with seed treatment with<br>Azotobactor IPM & INM  | 20           |                        | 10           | 12                     | 55           | 21                  |  |
|                | farmers<br>management   | $(N_{80}P_{60}K_{40})$ kg/ha  | 30           | 60                     | 30           | 67                     | 60           | 127                 |  |
|                |   | Total   | 110          | 233                    | 90           | 198                    | 200          | 431                 |  |

| Сгор      | Num-<br>ber of<br>demons-<br>tra-<br>tion | Area | Yield<br>Po-<br>ten-<br>tial | (q/ha)<br>De-<br>mons-<br>tra-<br>tion | Local<br>check | Per-<br>cen-<br>tage<br>in-<br>crease<br>over<br>local | Tech-<br>no-<br>logy<br>gap<br>(q/ha) | Ex-<br>ten-<br>sion<br>gap<br>(q/ha) | Techno-<br>logy<br>index<br>(%) |
|-----------|---|------|------------------------------|--|----------------|--|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Sesame    | 20  | 40   | 6                            | 4.63                                   | 2.56           | 80.85  | 1.37                                  | 0.07                                 | 22.83                           |
| Groundnut | 40  | 73   | 19                           | 17.36                                  | 10.25          | 69.36  | 1.64                                  | 7.11                                 | 8.63                            |
| Niger     | 45  | 94   | 6                            | 4.94                                   | 2.71           | 82.28  | 1.06                                  | 2.23                                 | 17.66                           |
| Linseed   | 35  | 97   | 7                            | 4.92                                   | 3              | 64   | 2.08                                  | 1.92                                 | 29.71                           |
| Mustard   | 60  | 127  | 16                           | 14.31                                  | 9.25           | 54.70  | 1.69                                  | 5.06                                 | 10.56                           |

Table 3. Productivity of oil seed crops, yield gaps and technology index (Average over year).

was collected for two years (2016-17 and 2017-18) from Cluster Front Line Demonstration (CFLD) plots to work out the economic feasibility of improved and scientific cultivation of oilseed crops over the local checks. The technology gap extension gaps and technology index were calculated as given by Samui et al. (2000) as :

- 1. Technology gap= Potential yield-Demonstration yield
- 2. Extension gap = Demonstration yield–Yield from farmers practice (Local check)

### **Results and Discussion**

Cluster Frontline Demonstration on Oilseed crops conducted by KVK, Chatra are given in Table 2. In each crops under Cluster Front Line Demonstration, the improved varieties which found suitable and given batter result under on farm trails (OFT) in local bio-physical and socio economic condition in Chatra District will be selected for demonstration with recommended package of practices. Techlogies which are demonstrated under Cluster Front Line Demonstration (CFLD) is given in Table 2.

During demonstration period study revealed that in cluster front line demonstration improved technologies increases productivity over local checks Table 3 revealed that improved technologies found higher productivity of Sesame, Groundnut, Niger, Linseed and Mustard. 4.63 g/ha, 17.36 g/ha, 4.94 g/ha, 4.92 g/ha and 14.31 g/ha respectively compare to farmers practices (Local check) 2.56 g/ha, 10.25 g/ha, 2.71 g/ ha 3.00 q/ha and 9.25 q/ha respectively. The increasing in productivity of Sesame, Groundnut, Niger, Linseed and Mustard over respectively local checks were 80.85%, 69.36%, 82.28%, 64.00% and 54.70% respectively. Higher productivity of different oilseed crops was found in Cluster Front Line Demonstration (CFLD) due to demonstration of improved varieties with full package of practices, Similar finding was also reported by Haque (2000), Jeengar et al. (2006), Balai et al. (2013). The year wise slight fluctuation in yield on demonstration was observed only due to farmers wise variation on skill and management practices.

Yield of the Cluster Front Line Demonstration and potential yield of the oilseed crops was compared to estimate the yield gaps which were further categorized into technology and extension gaps. The technology gap shows the gap in the demonstration yield over potential yield and it was highest in linseed (2.08 q/ha) comparison to Sesame, Groundnut, Niger and Mustard (1.35 q/ha) (1.64 q/ha) Niger (1.06 q/ha) and Mustard (1.69 q/ha) respectively. The technology gap was observed due to uncontrolled condition in demonstration plot. Farmers are not following the same practices which are recommended even sowing time, application of nutrient, irrigation schedule, weeding. Further higher extension gap 7.11 q/ha was recorded in Groundnut, after Mustard (5.06 g/ha) and Niger (2.23 q/ha), Sesame (2.07 q/ha) and Linseed (1.92 q/ha) respectively. It is also due to unawareness

|            |   |            |                        |                     | 2016-1   | 7            |                      |                      |                     | 2017-18                |              |                |
|------------|---|------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|--------------|----------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------------|--------------|----------------|
| Sl.<br>No. | Particular                              |            | Se-<br>same            | Gro-<br>und-<br>nut | Ni-<br>ger   | Lin-<br>seed | Mus-<br>tard         | Se-<br>same          | Gro-<br>und-<br>nut | Ni-<br>ger             | Lin-<br>seed | Mus-<br>tard   |
| 1          | Yield                                   | DP<br>FP   | 4.48<br>2.5            | 18.09<br>16         | 4.78<br>2.5  | 4.73<br>3    | 14.62<br>9           | 4.78<br>2.63         | 16.64<br>1.5        | 5.1<br>2.92            | 5.12<br>3    | 14<br>9.5      |
| 2          | Cost of<br>cultiva-<br>tion (Rs/<br>ha) | DP<br>FP   | 4200<br>32600          | 35000<br>20500      | 4200<br>3600   | 4200<br>3600 | 17000<br>14600       | 4200<br>3600         | 35000<br>20500      | 4200<br>3600           | 4200<br>3600 | 17000<br>14600 |
| 3          | Additio-<br>nal cost<br>of culti-       |            |                        |                     |  |              |                      |                      |                     |                        |              |                |
|            | vation<br>over<br>local<br>(Rs/ha)      | DP         | 600                    | 14500               | 600  | 600          | 2400                 | 600                  | 5500                | 600                    | 600          | 2400           |
| 4          | Gross<br>return                         | DP         | 17920                  | 54270               | 11950  | 11825        | 36550                | 19120                | 49920               | 12750                  | 12800        | 35000          |
| 5          | (Rs/ha)<br>Net re-<br>turns             | FP<br>DP   | 10000<br>13720         | 30000<br>19270      | 6250<br>7750   | 7500<br>7625 | 22500<br>19550       | 10520<br>14920       | 31500<br>14920      | 7300<br>8550           | 7500<br>8600 | 23750<br>18000 |
| 6          | (Rs/ha)<br>Addi-                        | FP         | 6400                   | 9500                | 2650   | 3900         | 7900                 | 6920                 | 11000               | 3700                   | 3900         | 9150           |
|            | tional<br>net re-                       |            |                        |                     |  |              |                      |                      |                     |                        |              |                |
|            | turn over<br>local (Rs/                 | DP         | 7320                   | 9770                | 5100   | 3725         | 11650                | 8000                 | 3920                | 4850                   | 4700         | 8850           |
| 7          | ha)<br>BC<br>ratio                      | DP<br>FP   | 4.26<br>2.77           | 1.55<br>1.46        | 2.84<br>1.73   | 2.81<br>2.08 | 2.15<br>1.54         | 4.55<br>2.92         | 1.42<br>1.53        | 3.03<br>2.02           | 3.04<br>2.08 | 2.05<br>1.62   |
| Tabl       | e 4. Continued.                         |            |                        |                     |  |              |                      |                      |                     |                        |              |                |
| Sl.<br>No. | Particular                              |            |                        |                     |  |              | Groundnut            |                      | ver all             | Linsee                 | d            | Mustard        |
| INO.       | Particulai                              |            |                        |                     | Sesar  | ne           | Groundhut            |                      | iger                |                        | u            | Iviustaru      |
| 1          | Yield                                   |            |                        | DP<br>FP            | 4.63<br>2.56   |              | 17.36<br>10.25       | 4.94<br>2.71         |                     | 4.92<br>3              |              | 14.31<br>9.25  |
| 2          | Cost of cult                            | ivation (R | ls/ha)                 | DP<br>FP            | 4200<br>3600   |              | 35000<br>20500       | 4200<br>3600         |                     | 4200<br>3600           |              | 17000<br>14600 |
| 3          | Additional cost of cultivation          |            |                        |                     |  |              |                      |                      |                     |                        |              |                |
| 4          | over local (I<br>Gross return           | /          |                        | DP<br>DP<br>ED      | 600<br>1852  |              | 5500<br>52095        | 600<br>12350         |                     | 600<br>IE + 06         |              | 2400<br>35775  |
| 5          | FP<br>Net returns (Rs/ha) DP<br>FP      |            | 10260<br>14320<br>6660 |                     | 30750         6775           17095         8150           10250         3175 |              | 150                  | 7500<br>8112<br>3900 |                     | 23125<br>18775<br>8525 |              |                |
| 6          | Additional r                            |            |                        |                     |  |              |                      | 5175                 |                     | 3900                   |              |                |
| 7          | over local (<br>BC ratio                | Rs/ha)     |                        | DP<br>DP<br>FP      | 7660<br>4.4<br>2.84  |              | 6845<br>1.48<br>1.49 | 2                    | 975<br>.93<br>87    | 4212<br>2.92<br>2.08   |              | 10250<br>2.1   |
|            |   |            |                        | FP                  | 2.84   |              | 1.49                 | 1                    | .87                 | 2.08                   |              | 1.58           |

Table 4. Economics of oilseeds crops production under Cluster Front Line Demonstration and farmers practices.

of improved technology of oilseed crops of farmers, it is also observed that the improved varieties, micronutrient, are not available in local market. Table 3 indicates that the technology index was minimum (8.63%) compare to Mustard (10.56%) and Niger (17.66%), Sesame (22.83%) and Linseed (29.71%) respectively. Technology index shows the suitability of technologies in farmer's micro farming and eco-

nomic situation and lower value of technology index shows more suitability of the technologies (Jeengar et al. 2006).

The input and outputs praises of commodities prevailed during each year of demonstrations were taken for calculating cost of cultivation.

Table 4 further shows that average yield of two years of different oilseed crops under Cluster Frontline Demonstration is Sesame (4.68 q/ha), Groundnut (17.36 q/ha), Niger (4.94 q/ha), Linseed (4.92 q/ ha) and Mustard (14.31 q/ha) compared to farmers practices (Local check) 2.56 q/ha, 10.25 q/ha, 2.71 q/ha, and 9.25 q/ha respectively. This increase over productivity over farmers practices (Local check) was 80.85%, 69.36%, 82.28%, 64.00% and 54.70% respectively of Sesame, Groundnut, Niger, Linseed and Mustard crops respectively.

Table 4 shows that economic analysis of the data cover two years groundnut under frontline demonstration recorded higher gross returns (Rs 52,095/ ha) net return (Rs 17,095/ha) and BC ratio (1.55) as compare to the local check where farmers got gross returns, Net returns and BC ratio of (Rs 30,750/ha), (Rs 10,250/ha) and (1.46) respectively. Sesame also recorded higher gross returns (Rs 18,520/ha) net return (Rs 14,320/ha) and BC ratio (4.40) as compare to the local check where farmers got gross return (Rs 10,260/ha), Net return (Rs 6,660/ha) and BC ratio (2.84) respectively. Niger also recorded higher gross return Rs 12, 350/ha, net return Rs 8,150/ha and BC ratio of 2.93 in improved technologies as compared to the local check where farmers get gross return, net return and BC ratio of Rs 6,775, Rs 3,175 and 1.87 respectively. Similarly linseed recorded higher gross return Rs 12,312.50/ha net return Rs 8,112/ha and BC ratio of 2.92 in Cluster Front Line Demonstration as compare to farmers practices gross return, Net return and BC ratio of Rs 7,500/ha, Rs 3,900/ha and 2.08 respectively. In case of Mustard highest gross return of (Rs 35,775/ha), Net return Rs 18,775/ha and BC ratio 2.1 as compare to farmers practice gross return, net return and BC ratio Rs 23,125/ha, 8,525 and 1.58 respectively. This finding supported with the finding of Tomar (2010) and Mokidue et al. (2011).

## Conclusion

Result shows that the grain yield of different oilseed crops i.e. Sesame, Groundnut Niger, Linseed and Mustard under Cluster Demonstration was increasing up to 80.85, 69.36, 82.28, 64.00 and 54.70% respectively compare to control farmers practice. It is due to demonstration of improved and high yielding varieties with full package of practices. The technological and extension gap was also minimized due to combination of appropriate technologies extension methodologies with strategy and extension services. Net income and cost benefit ratio was also increased in demonstration plot due to improved package of practices and reducing cost of cultivation of oilseed crops.

#### References

- Balai CM, Bairwa RK, Verma LN, Roat BL, Jalwania R (2013) Economic impact of front line demonstrations on cereal crops in tribal belt of Rajasthan. Int J Agric Sci 3 (7) : 566—570.
- Haque MS (2000) Impact of compact block demonstration on increase in productivity of rice. Maharashtra. J Ext Edu 19 (1) : 22–27.
- Jeengar KL, Panwar Paswan, Pareek OP (2006) Front line demonstration on maize in Bhilwara District of Rajasthan. Curr Agric 30 (1–2) : 115—116.
- Mokidue Islam, Mohanty AK, Sanjay Kumar (2011) Correlating growth, yield and adoption of urbdean technologies. Ind J Ext Edu 11 (2): 20–24.
- Samui SK, Maitra S, Roy DK, Mondal AK, Saha D (2000) Evaluation on front line demonstration on groundnut (Arachis hypogeal L.). J Ind Soc Coa Agric Res 18 : 180—183.
- Tomar RKS (2010) Maximization of productivity for chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* Linn.) through improved technologies in farmers fields. Ind J Nat Prod Resour 1 : 515—517.