



**OYSTER MUSHROOM (*PLEUROTUS* SPP.): ADOPTION
PERCENTAGE OF MUSHROOM TRAINEES OF COOCH BEHAR
KRISHI VIGYAN KENDRA- A REVIEW**

Ganesh Das and Suraj Sarkar*

Cooch Behar Krishi Vigyan Kendra, Uttar Banga Krishi Viswavidyalaya, Pundibari, Cooch
Behar.

Article Received on 01/12/2015

Article Revised on 25/12/2015

Article Accepted on 17/01/2016

***Correspondence for**

Author

Suraj Sarkar

Cooch Behar Krishi Vigyan
Kendra, Uttar Banga Krishi
Viswavidyalaya, Pundibari,
Cooch Behar.

INTRODUCTION

For thousands of years mushroom has been providing a powerful source of nutrients. The cultivation of oyster mushroom in India is mainly done in seasonal low cost growing rooms with very less expenditure on infrastructure. One can hardly find a big oyster mushroom growing unit in India having rounded the year production. There is no organized market where one can sell his produce or

purchase fresh or dry oyster mushroom throughout the year. Therefore, the production of oyster mushroom on a commercial scale is rare in our country as compared to *Agaricus bisporus* (button mushroom). The oyster mushroom is one of the most suitable fungal organism for producing protein rich food from various agrowastes without composting. This mushroom is cultivated in about 25 countries of far-east Asia, Europe and America. It is the 3rd largest cultivated mushroom in the world. China alone contributes 88% of the total world production. The other major oyster producing countries are South Korea, Japan, Italy, Taiwan, Thailand and Philippines. At present India produces annually 10,000 tons of this mushroom. It is popularly grown in the states of Orissa, Karnataka, Maharashtra, Andhra Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, and West Bengal and in the North-Eastern States of Meghalaya, Tripura Manipur, Mizoram and Assam. Mushroom cultivation specially *Pleurotus ostreatus* and *Pleurotus sajor-caju* in Cooch Behar district is hereby increasing day to day but still there is a rising trend in its demand. Mushroom growing as a cottage industry is quite valid for the SHG women due to its low capital investment and high yields obtained even under

controlled rural condition. According to Dirksen, Ament, and Go 1996; Marshall 1990; Meyer, Johnson, and Ethington 1997; and Rogers 1995 Innovations that have a clear, unambiguous advantage in either effectiveness or cost-effectiveness are more easily adopted and Innovations that are perceived by key players as simple to use are more easily adopted. According to Plsek 2003 Perceived complexity can be reduced by practical experience and demonstration. According to Plsek 2003; and Rogers 1995 if the innovation can be broken down into more manageable parts and adopted incrementally, it will be more easily adopted. Interventions to reduce the number and extent of such response barriers improve the chances of successful adoption. According to Denis et al. 2002; Grilli and Lomas 1994; Meyer and Goes 1988; and Øvretveit et al. 2002 if the benefits of an innovation are visible to intended adopters, it will be adopted more easily. According to Adler, Kwon, and Singer 2003; Aubert and Hamel 2001; and O'Neill, Poudier, and Buchholtz 2002 if the knowledge required for the innovation's use can be codified and transferred from one context to another, it will be adopted more easily. According to Hall and Hord 1987; and Wejnert 2002 if the innovation meets an identified need by the intended adopter, he or she is more likely to adopt it. According to Fennell and Warnecke 1988; Fitzgerald et al. 2002; and West et al. 1999 the adoption of innovations by individuals is more likely if they are homophilous—that is, have similar socioeconomic, educational, professional, and cultural backgrounds—with current users of the innovation. The awareness for mushroom has been created among the rural youth and woman by Cooch Behar KVK by conducting residential training programme on successful mushroom cultivation. The training was conducted during August, 2013 to August 2014 and the study was conducted during January, 2015 to February, 2015. The purpose of this study is to identify the rate of adoption of mushroom cultivation of the respondents after getting training at KVK.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study was conducted on the respondent who took Mushroom training in Cooch Behar Krishi Vigyan Kendra, district- Cooch Behar from August, 2013 to August, 2014. The study was conducted during January to February, 2015. The research design was followed in the study was survey research method. The respondents for this study included from the Cooch Behar district. The entire trainees available at the time of investigation were considered as respondents. The sample size for the study was 195. The dependent variable of this study was adoption and independent variables were age, gender, education and caste. The descriptive statistics like frequency, percentage and other statistical tools were used for the investigation

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

It was shown after investigation that a great majority of the respondent participated in mushroom training were male farmer (82%) followed by female farmer (18%). It was shown that majority percentages of respondent adopted mushroom cultivation were male farmer (24.37%) closely followed by women farmer (17.14%). It was found from survey that the majority percentage of the farmer participated in mushroom training in general belonged to the range of 26yrs to 35yrs (56.92%) of the age group followed by 18yrs to 25 yrs (30.76%) and adoption percentage of mushroom cultivation were high in case of 25-35 yrs age group (27.92%) followed by 18-25 yrs age group (18.33%). It was shown after investigation that majority of respondent participated in mushroom training were SC (43.07%) category farmer closely followed by GEN (42.05%) category farmer but In case of adoption of mushroom cultivation it was shown that SC(28.57) category farmer adopted higher percentage followed by OBC category farmer(25%) and GEN category farmer (19.51%). It was also shown from the investigation that only 7.69 % of the ST farmers adopted mushroom cultivation. It was observed from the investigation that the majority percentage of the respondent educational level at the time mushroom training was high school (46.66%) pass followed by graduate and above (28.20%) but it was found from the survey that majority percentages of the respondent adopted mushroom cultivation were middle school pass (29.16%) closely followed by graduate and above pass (25.45%). It was found from the investigation that overall percentage of the mushroom cultivation was 23.07.

CONCLUSION

It can be concluded from the investigation that both male and female farmer were interested to go for mushroom cultivation for getting higher return within a short period of time. it was shown from the investigation that majority of the farmer adopted mushroom cultivation belong to the age group of 26-35 yrs due to may be self employment generation. It was shown from the investigation that only 7.69 % of the ST farmer were adopted mushroom, it may be due to communication problem, educational problem and others problem which are commonly associated with this area of ST community. It was found from the investigation that majority percentage of farmer adopted mushroom cultivation was middle school pass; it may be due to less govt. employment opportunity. It was also observed that graduate and above pass category farmer adopted mushroom cultivation higher than high school pass and primary school pass category farmer, it may be due to hard job competition or others.

REFERENCE

1. Abrahamson, E. Managerial Fads and Fashions: The Diffusion and Rejection of Innovation. *California Management Review*, 1991; 16: 586–612.
2. Adler, P.S., S-W. Kwon, and J.M.K. Singer. 2003. The “Six-West” Problem: Professionals and the Intraorganizational Diffusion of Innovations, with Particular Reference to the Case of Hospitals. Working paper 3–15. Marshall School of Business, University of Southern California.
3. Anderson, N.R., and N.A. West. Measuring Climate for Work Group Innovation. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 1998; 19: 235–58.
4. Aubert, B.A., and G. Hamel. Adoption of Smart Cards in the Medical Sector: The Canadian Experience. *Social Science & Medicine*, 2001; 53(7): 879–94.
5. Backer, T.E., and E.M. Rogers. Diffusion of Innovations Theory and Work-Site AIDS Programs. *Journal of Health Communication*, 1998; 3(1):17–28.
6. Bourdenave, J.D. Communication of Agricultural Innovations in Latin America: The Need for New Models. *Communication Research*, 1976; 3(2):135–54.
7. Buckler, S.A., and C. Zein. The Spirituality of Innovation: Learning from Stories. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, September 1996; 13: 391–405.
8. Burns, L.R., and D.R. Wholey. Adoption and Abandonment of Matrix Management Programs: Effects of Organizational Characteristics and Interorganizational Networks. *Academy of Management Journal*, 1993; 36:106–38.
9. Burt, R.S. The Differential Impact of Social Integration on Participation in the Diffusion of Innovations. *Social Science Research*, 1973; 2(2): 125–44.
10. Champagne, F., J-L. Denis, R. Pineault, and A. Contandriopoulos. Structural and Political Models of Analysis of the Introduction of an Innovation in Organizations: The Case of the Change in the Method of Payment of Physicians in Long-Term Care Hospitals. *Health Services Management Research*, 1991; 4(42): 94–111.
11. Dearing, J.W., and O. And. Portraying the New: Communication between University Innovators and Potential Users. *Science Communication*, 1994; 16(1):11–42.
12. Denis, J.L., Y. Hebert, A. Langley, D. Lozeau, and L.H. Trottier. Explaining Diffusion Patterns for Complex Health Care Innovations. *Health Care Management Review*, 2002; 27(3): 60–73.
13. Dirksen, C.D., A.J. Ament, and P.M. Go. Diffusion of Six Surgical Endoscopic Procedures in the Netherlands. Stimulating and Restraining Factors. *Health Policy*, 1996; 37(2): 91–104.

14. Dopson, S., L. Fitzgerald, E. Ferlie, J. Gabbay, and L. Locock. No Magic Targets. Changing Clinical Practice to Become More Evidence Based. *Health Care Management Review*, 2002; 37: 35–47.
15. Eveland, J.D. Diffusion, Technology Transfer and Implementation. *Knowledge: Creation, Diffusion, Utilisation*, 1986; 8(2): 303–22.
16. Fennell, M.L., and R.B. Warnecke. *The Diffusion of Medical Innovations: An Applied Network Analysis*. New York: Plenum. 1988.
17. Ferlie, E., J. Gabbay, L. Fitzgerald, L. Locock, and S. Dopson. Evidence-Based Medicine and Organisational Change: An Overview of Some Recent Qualitative Research. In *Organisational Behaviour and Organisational Studies in Health Care: Reflections on the Future*, edited by L. Ashburner. Basingstoke: Palgrave. 2001.
18. Fitzgerald, L., E. Ferlie, M. Wood, and C. Hawkins. Interlocking Interactions, the Diffusion of Innovations in Health Care. *Human Relations*, 2002; 55(12):1429–49.
19. Goes, J.B., and S.H. Park. Interorganisational Links and Innovation: The Case of Hospital Services. *Academy of Management Journal*, 1997; 40(3): 673–96.
20. Granados, A., E. Jonsson, H.D. Banta, L. Bero, A. Bonair, C. Cochet, N. Freemantle, R. Grilli, J. Grimshaw, E. Harvey, R. Levi, D. Marshall, A. Oxman, L. Pasart, V. Raisanen, E. Rius, and J.A. Espinas. EUR-ASSESS Project Subgroup Report on Dissemination and Impact. *International Journal of Technology Assessment in Health Care*, 1997; 13(2): 220–86.
21. Granovetter, M., and R. Soong. Threshold Models of Diffusion and Collective Behavior. *Journal of Mathematical Sociology*, 1983; 9: 165–79.
22. Grilli, R., and J. Lomas. Evaluating the Message: The Relationship between Compliance Rate and the Subject of a Practice Guideline. *Medical Care*, 1994; 32(3): 202–13.
23. Hall, G.E., and S.M. Hord. *Change in Schools*. Albany: State University of New York Press. 1987.
24. Horbar, J.D., J. Rogowski, P.E. Plsek, P. Delmore, W.H. Edwards, J. Hocker, A.D. Katak, P. Lewallen, W. Lewis, E. Lewit, C.J. McCarroll, D. Majsce, N.R. Payne, P. Shiono, R.F. Soll, K. Leahy, and J.H. Carpenter. Collaborative Quality Improvement for Neonatal Intensive Care. *Pediatrics*, 2001; 107(1):14–22.
25. House, R., D.M. Rousseau, and M. Thomas-Hunt. The Meso Paradigm: A Framework for the Integration of Micro and Macro Organisational Behaviour. *Research in Organizational Behaviour*, 1995; 17: 71–114.

26. Hughes, J., C. Humphrey, S. Rogers, and T. Greenhalgh. Evidence into Action: Changing Practice in Primary Care. *Occasional Papers, Royal College of General Practitioners*, 2002; 84: 1–51.
27. Kimberly, J.R., and J.M. Evanisko. Organisational Innovation: The Influence of Individual, Organisational and Contextual Factors on Hospital Adoption of Technological and Administrative Innovation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 1981; 24(4): 689–713.
28. Leape, L.L., A.I. Kabacoff, T.K. Gandhi, P. Carver, T.W. Nolan, and D.M. Berwick. Reducing Adverse Drug Events: Lessons from a Breakthrough Series Collaborative. *Joint Commission Journal on Quality Improvement*, 2000; 26: 321–31.
29. Lomas, J. Using “Linkage and Exchange” to Move Research into Policy at a Canadian Foundation. *Health Affairs*, 2000; 19(3): 236–40.
30. Markham, S.K. A Longitudinal Examination of How Champions Influence Others to Support Their Projects. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 1998; 15(6): 490–504.
31. Marshall, J.G. Diffusion of Innovation Theory and End-User Searching. *Library & Information Science Research*, 1990; 6(1): 55–69.
32. McCormick, L.K., A.B. Steckler, and K.R. Mcleroy. Diffusion of Innovations in Schools: A Study of Adoption and Implementation of School-Based Tobacco Prevention Curricula. *American Journal of Health Promotion*, 1995; 9(3): 210–9.
33. Meyer, A.D., and J.B. Goes. Organisational Assimilation of Innovations: A Multi-Level Contextual Analysis. *Academy of Management Review*, 1988; 31: 897–923.
34. Meyer, M., D. Johnson, and C. Ethington. Contrasting Attributes of Preventive Health Innovations. *Journal of Communication*, 1997; 47: 112–31.
35. Meyers, P.W., K. Sivakumar, and C. Nakata. Implementation of Industrial Process Innovations: Factors, Effects, and Marketing Implications. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 1999; 16(3): 295–311.
36. Nystrom, P.C., K. Ramamurthy, and A.L. Wilson. Organizational Context, Climate and Innovativeness: Adoption of Imaging Technology. *Journal of Engineering and Technology Management*, 2002; 19(3–4): 221–47.
37. O'Neill, H.M., P.W. Poudel, and A.K. Buchholtz. Patterns in the Diffusion of Strategies across Organisations: Insights from the Innovation Diffusion Literature. *Academy of Management Review*, 2002; 23(1): 98–114.
38. Øvretveit, J. 2003. *Reviewing Medical Management Research for Decision-Makers: Methodological Issues in Carrying Out Systematic Reviews of Medical Management*

- Research*. Stockholm: Karolinska Institute (Medical Management Centre internal discussion document).
39. Øvretveit, J., P. Bate, P. Cleary, S. Cretin, D. Gustafson, K. McInnes, H. McLeod, T. Molfenter, P. Plsek, G. Robert, S. Shortell, and T. Wilson. Quality Collaboratives: Lessons from Research. *Quality and Safety in Health Care*, 2002; 11: 345–51.
 40. Plsek, P. Complexity and the Adoption of Innovation in Health Care. Paper presented at Accelerating Quality Improvement in Health Care: Strategies to Accelerate the Diffusion of Evidence-Based Innovations. Washington, D.C.: National Institute for Healthcare Management Foundation and National Committee for Quality in Health Care. 2003.
 41. Riemer-Reiss, M.L. Applying Rogers' Diffusion of Innovations Theory to Assistive Technology Discontinuance. *Journal of Applied Rehabilitation Counseling*, 1999; 30(4): 16–21.
 42. Rogowski, J.A., J.D. Horbar, P.E. Plsek, B.L. Schuurmann, J. Deterding, W.H. Edwards, J. Hocker, A.D. Kantak, P. Lewallen, W. Lewis, E. Lewit, C.J. McCarroll, D. Mujisce, N.R. Payne, P. Shiono, R.F. Soll, and K. Leahy. Economic Implications of Neonatal Intensive Care Unit Collaborative Quality Improvement. *Pediatrics*, 2001; 107(1): 23–9..
 43. Tornatsky, L.G., and K.J. Klein. Innovation Characteristics and Innovation-Adoption-Implementation: A Meta-Analysis of Findings. *Transactions on Engineering Management*, 1982; 29(1): 28–45.
 44. Wejnert, B. Integrating Models of Diffusion of Innovations: A Conceptual Framework. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 2002; 28: 297–326.
 45. West, E., D.N. Barron, J. Dowsett, and J.N. Newton. Hierarchies and Cliques in the Social Networks of Health Care Professionals: Implications for the Design of Dissemination Strategies. *Social Science & Medicine*, 1999; 48(5): 633–46.
 46. Shortell. Customization or Conformity? An Institutional and Network Perspective on the Content and Consequences of Total Quality Management Adoption. *Administrative Sciences Quarterly*, 1997; 42(366): 394.
 47. Wilson, A.L., K. Ramamurthy, and P.C. Nystrom. A Multi-Attribute Measure for Innovation Adoption: The Context of Imaging Technology. *Transactions on Engineering Management*, 1999; 46(3): 311–21.
 48. Zahra, A.S., and G. George. Absorptive Capacity: A Review, Reconceptualization and Extension. *Academy of Management Review*, 2002; 27(2): 185–203.