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Abstract

The present study on performance of dicoccum wheat variety DDK-1029 under frontline demonstration in Bagalkote District of Karnataka, India was conducted at ICAR-Krishi Vigyan Kendra, Bagalkot. The dicoccum wheat variety DDK-1029 with package of practice, which was developed by University of Agricultural Sciences, Dharwad was used. The study was conducted in 30 demonstrations in 12 ha of farmer’s field in different villages of Bagalkote for three years (2016-17 to 2018-19). The productivity of dicoccum wheat ranged from 25.23 to 31.50 q/ha with mean yield of 27.89q/ha under demonstration field as against a yield ranged from 22.20 to 28.30 q/ha with a mean of 24.73 q/ha recorded under farmers practice. In comparison to farmers practice 12.92% higher productivity was observed in demonstrated field. The dicoccum wheat variety DDK-1029 with improved package of practice recorded higher gross returns (Rs. 48739/ha), net return (Rs. 26227/ha) and B:C ratio (2.19) as compared to farmers practice. Further by inclusion of dicoccum wheat variety DDK-1029 with improved package of practice realized an additional income of Rs. 5584 per hectare, which created awareness and motivated the other farmers to adopt.
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Introduction

One of the most important winter food crops of India is wheat and its productivity has played a key role in making the country self-sufficient in food grain. It is the crop which triggered green revolution in India. It is estimated that more than 35 per cent of world population depends on wheat. It supplies the daily protein requirement of human diet up to 60 per cent, than any other crop.

In India, wheat is the second most important food crop next to rice and it contributes nearly 35 per cent to national food basket. Among food crops, it contributes about 35.81 per cent of the food grain. During the crop year 2016-17, wheat was grown over an area 30.79 million hectare with the total production of 98.51 million tones and a productivity of 3200 kg per hectare which shares 12.43% of total production in the world (Anon, 2018) [1]. Delayed sowing of wheat (December or early January) causing poor seed yield, due to sub-optimal temperature at sowing, which causes delayed in germination, slow growth and development phase (Tiwari et al., 2015) [2]. Further, delayed in sowing causes supra optimal thermal stress during reproductive phases which results in forced maturity. The poor agronomic management practices such as seed rate, location specific improved variety, nutrient and irrigation management so on are responsible for low productivity of wheat in India in general and Karnataka in particular.

Among the wheat, dicoccum wheat cultivation is unique in peninsular zone. It is nutritionally rich because of presence of higher protein content, more dietary fiber, resistant starch and high thermal value. The food prepared out of this wheat has high satiety value, unique flavor and good keeping quality. The dicoccum wheat growing farmers predominantly cultivated local types. This necessitated the development of high yielding dicoccum wheat varieties. To improve the yield potential and lodging tolerance, semi dwarf variety DDK 1029 was developed.
Bagalkote district has a substantiate area under dicoccum wheat which is grown under irrigation. Dicoccum wheat is known for its nutraceutical value of regulating blood glucose level, dicoccum wheat is one of the major rabi/winter cereal crop of Bagalkote district.

**The present study was taken with the following objectives**

- To study the difference between technology introduced with local farmers practice in terms of extension gap, technology gap and technology index.
- To compare the yield and economics of demonstrated plots with farmers practice.

**Materials and Methods**

The present study was conducted at ICAR-Krishi Vigyan Kendra, Bagalkote, Karnataka in an operational area of KVK, for three years (2016-17 to 2018-19) the information on existing cultivation practices by the farmers were collected during pre-season by interacting. The information comprises of variety used, yield, profit and problem faced by the farmers. Based on the collected information, technological gaps were identified and a suitable package of practice were prepared and introduced in the demonstration. The farmers having irrigation facility were selected for the study by adopting the University of Agricultural Sciences, Dharwad package of practice (Table 1).

There are number of dicoccum wheat varieties were developed by University of Agricultural Sciences, Dharwad. ICAR-Krishi Vigyan Kendra, Bagalkote being a ToT centre under the aegis of UAS, Dharwad involved in disseminating technologies suitable to meet the needs of farmers of this region. Dicoccum wheat variety (DDK-1029) which is evolved as superior over local variety was assessed for its performance in Bagalkote district during 2016-17, 2017-18 and 2018-19.

Dicoccum wheat variety DDK-1029 is most suitable for timely sown irrigated condition of peninsular and central zone. It is semi-dwarf in nature; tolerant to lodging, it is high yielding by early maturing as compared to local types. It is best suitable both for chapati and macaroni preparation. It has low glycemic index and hence most suitable for diabetic patients. It matures in 100 to 105 days, it resistance to insect pests and major diseases, tolerance to heat stress, excellent grain quality, nutritional and therapeutic value. It is suitable for Semolina, Chapati, Dhalia, Macaroni and Pasta products (Anon., 2020)[2].

The farmers which are growing dicoccum wheat were purposively selected based on their willingness to participate in the demonstration, whose fields are located near main road. The study was carried by taking 0.4 ha unit area from each farmer and total 4 ha field with 10 farmers in each year; total 30 demonstration in 12 ha of farmers field in different villages of Bagalkote district for three years. For the comparison between demonstration and farmers practice, other field grown by the same farmer or different farmer adjoining to the demonstration field were used. For each year farmers have been trained for adopting improved package of practice by conducting on and off campus trainings.

The certified seeds of dicoccum wheat variety DDK-1029 were purchased from the Seed Unit, University of Agricultural Sciences, Dharwad. Seed as the critical input @ 60 kg/ha were provided to the participating farmers. For seed treatment Azospirillum were purchased from Institute of Organic Farming, University of Agricultural Sciences, Dharwad and remaining inputs were purchased from the local market. The expenditure on recommended fertilizers and plant protection measures were borne by them. The data on cost of cultivation, yield were collected from each selected framer as well as from non-practicing farmer. For calculation of economics, price of the produce has been collected from Agricultural Produce Marker Committee (APMC), Bagalkote.

From the collected data yield, cost of cultivation, gross returns, net profit and B:C ratio were worked out. The extension gap, technology gap and technology index were estimated (Samui et al., 2000) [4] by the following formulae and final conclusions were drawn.

1. Extension gap = Demonstration yield – Farmers yield
2. Technology gap = Potential yield – Demonstration yield
3. Technology index = [(Potential yield – Demonstration yield)/ Potential yield] X 100

**Results and Discussion**

**Yield**

The yield obtained over the years under recommended and farmers practice are presented in table 2. The productivity of dicoccum wheat ranged from 25.23 to 31.50 q/ha with mean yield of 27.89q/ha under demonstration field as against a yield ranged from 22.20 to 28.30 q/ha with a mean of 24.73 q/ha recorded under farmers practice. In comparison to farmers practice there was an increase of 13.89, 11.30 and 13.63% higher productivity, respectively during 2016-17, 2017-18 and 2018-19 following demonstration field. The higher yield of dicoccum wheat under demonstration field was due to the use of latest and improved high yielding variety and with its recommended cultivation practice. These results are same with the findings of Tiwari et al. (2015)[5].

**Extension gap**

An extension gap between demonstrated field and farmers practices was worked out and it ranges from 3.03 to 3.27 q/ha with an average of 3.17 q/ha during three year study period (Table 2). This indicates that, farmers need to be educated for the adoption of improved technology with high yielding varieties through various extension activities to reverse the wider and alarming trend of galloping extension gap.

**Technology gap**

The difference between potential yield and demonstrated yield was explained as technology gap. The data on technology gap was ranged from 28.40 to 34.67 q/ha with an average of 3.21 q/ha during three year study period (Table 2). This may be due variation in fertility and weather conditions of the area. To narrow down the technology gap, location specific recommendation appears to be necessary. These results are in line with the findings of Hiremath and Nagaraju (2009)[3].

**Technology index**

Feasibility of the improved technology at the farmer’s field was indicated by technology index, lower the index higher will be the feasibility of improved technology. In this study lower technology index (47.41) was observed in 2017-18, which was followed by 55.01 and 57.88 per cent in 2016-17 and 2018-19, respectively (Table 2).

During 2017-18 lower technology index was appeared, this may be due to dicoccum wheat variety DDK-1029 performed well with improved technology in an area of higher soil fertility which was coupled with good weather condition. These results are similar to the findings of Hiremath and Nagaraju (2009)[3].
Economics

The economics of the demonstration technology and farmers practice were worked out for every demonstrating year in this study which was presented in Table 3. The data on economic analysis over the year revealed the dicoccum wheat variety DDK-1029 with improved package of practice recorded higher gross returns (Rs. 48739/ha), net return (Rs. 26227/ha) and B:C ratio (2.19) as compared to farmers practice. Further by inclusion of dicoccum wheat variety DDK-1029 with improved package of practice realized an additional income of Rs. 5584 per hectare. The results revealed that higher profitability and economic viability of dicoccum wheat variety DDK-1029 with improved package of practice under local agro-ecological situation.

Table 1: Comparison of technology intervention and farmers practice under dicoccum wheat frontline demonstration

| Sl. No. | Particulars                                      | Frontline demonstration | Farmers Practice | Gap       |
|---------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|-----------|
| 1       | Variety                                         | DDK-1029                | Local           | Full gap  |
| 2       | Seed rate (kg/ha)                               | 150                     | 200             | Partial gap |
| 3       | Seed treatment                                  | Azospirillum             | No              | Full gap  |
| 4       | Sowing method                                   | Seed cum fertilizer drill | Seed drill      | Partial gap |
| 5       | Spacing                                         | 23 cm row spacing       | 45 cm row spacing | Partial gap |
| 6       | Depth of sowing                                 | 5 cm                    | Deep sowing     | Full gap  |
| 7       | Sowing date                                     | October 2nd fortnight to December 1st fortnight | November 2nd fortnight to December 2nd fortnight | Partial gap |
| 8       | Fertilizer application                          | 30:30:20 kg NPK/ha at the time of sowing and 30 kg N/ha after 30 day after sowing | 125 kg DAP/ha and 125 kg urea | Partial gap |
| 9       | Weed control                                    | Pre-emergent application of Pendimethalin 30 EC@ 3.25 l/ha and one intercultivation | Two intercultivation and hand weeding | Partial gap |
| 10      | Number of irrigation                            | 6                       | 7               | Partial gap |
| 11      | Plant protection                                | Based on recommended dose (as per package of practice) | Over dose and un recommended brands of pesticides | Partial gap |

Table 2: Yield and yield gap analysis of frontline demonstration and farmers practice

| Year     | No. of demos | Area (ha) | Potential yield (q/ha) | Yield (q/ha) | Increase (%) | Extension gap (q/ha) | Technology gap (q/ha) | Technology Index (%) |
|----------|--------------|-----------|------------------------|--------------|--------------|----------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
|          |              |           |                        | Demo        | FP           |                       |                      |                     |
| 2016-17  | 10           | 4         | 59.9                   | 26.95       | 23.68        | 13.81                | 3.27                 | 32.95               | 55.01               |
| 2017-18  | 10           | 4         | 59.9                   | 31.50       | 28.30        | 11.31                | 3.20                 | 34.80               | 47.41               |
| 2018-19  | 10           | 4         | 59.9                   | 25.23       | 22.20        | 13.65                | 3.03                 | 34.67               | 57.88               |
| Mean     | 10           | 4         | 59.9                   | 27.89       | 24.73        | 12.92                | 3.17                 | 32.01               | 53.43               |

FP: Farmers practice

Table 3: Economics of dicoccum wheat in technology intervention and farmers practice under frontline demonstration

| Year     | Cost of Cultivation (Rs./ha) | Gross returns (Rs./ha) | Net returns (Rs./ha) | Additional Income (Rs./ha) | B:C ratio |
|----------|------------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|-----------|
|          | Demo                        | FP                     | Demo                 | FP                         |           |
| 2016-17  | 20125                       | 21150                  | 52353                | 46166                      | 32428     | 26041 | 6387 | 2.61 | 2.18 |
| 2017-18  | 22575                       | 23290                  | 47250                | 42450                      | 24675     | 19875 | 4800 | 2.09 | 1.82 |
| 2018-19  | 24835                       | 25355                  | 46414                | 40848                      | 21579     | 16013 | 5566 | 1.87 | 1.61 |
| Mean     | 22512                       | 23265                  | 48739                | 43155                      | 26227     | 20643 | 5584 | 2.19 | 1.87 |

FP: Farmers practice

Conclusion

From the study it can be concluded that, yield of dicoccum wheat variety DDK-1029 with improved technology was increased by 12.94 percent (Average of three years) over the farmer practice with an additional income of Rs. 5584 per hectare, which created awareness and motivated the other farmers to adopt. The beneficiary farmers of the frontline demonstration also play an important role as a source of information for wider dissemination of high yielding dicoccum wheat to nearby farmers. Thus, the frontline demonstration is an effective tool for increasing area, production and productivity of dicoccum wheat by changing the knowledge, skill and attitude of the farmers on the adoption of improved technologies.
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