

RESEARCH NOTE

## **Training Need Hierarchy of Village Level Workers**

**B. B. Patel<sup>1</sup>, A. O. Kher<sup>2</sup> and V. D. Suryavanshi<sup>3</sup>**

### **INTRODUCTION**

Being the extension functionary at village level, the Village Level Workers (VLWs) must have a great deal of accurate knowledge for timely communication to the rural masses. Regular inservice training is the best means of providing continuous learning and will keep the VLWs abreast of the latest information and technical know-how in agriculture. Hence, with this in view the present study was conducted with the following objectives.

### **OBJECTIVES**

1. To know the level of training acquired by the VLWs except fortnightly training.
2. To identify the training needs of the VLWs with respect to communication methods, techniques and subject matter training.

### **METHODOLOGY**

The study was conducted in the Junagadh district of Gujarat State as T & V system has been running since 1978 in this district. All the VLWs were considered as a sample of study.

Out of 180, 116 VLWs who were present at fortnightly training on the day of personal interview were selected as respondents for the study and their responses were collected through structured interview schedule. The respondents were asked to furnish the information about the type of training they have attended. A score of one was given to each training undergone. The mean and S. D. was used to categorise the respondents. An inservice training need inventory based on available researches in the area, field experiences, job chart of the VLWs and personal discussion with VLWs prepared. This consisted of 18 items. The items were rated by the respondents on a 3-point rating scale : 'most needed', 'needed' and 'not needed' with the weights of 3,2 and 1 respectively. To lay down the need hierarchy, the mean score for each item was calculated on the basis of which ranks were assigned to them. The items were then arranged in descending order of the ranks.

### **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

The information pertaining to training acquired by the respondents is presented in Table 1.

- 
1. Asso. Extension Educationist, EEI, GAU, Anand.
  2. Dy. Director of Extn. Edu. (Zone), GAU, Junagadh.
  3. Asso. Extn. Educationist, Extn. Deptt., N. M. College of Agriculture, Navsari.

**Table 1 : Information regarding training acquired by the VLWs.**

Sr. No.	Level of acquired training	Number	Per cent
1.	Low (upto 1 score)	55	47.41
2.	Medium ( 2 to 3 score)	54	46.55
3.	Highly trained (score 4 and above)	7	6.04
Total		116	100.00

It could be seen from the data in Table 1 that nearly equal number of respondents (55 and 54) were acquired low and medium training respectively, While, only 6.04 per cent respondents (7 out of 116) were from highly trained group. This might be due to the facilities might have been created after introduction of the T&V system. The observed results were in line with those of Gangani (1989) and Sharma (1993).

From Table 2, it is apparent that, out of 18 major areas, VLWS had assigned first to "New package of practices for Groundnut Cultivation" and second rank to "plant protection" followed by "Communication techniques", "programme planning", "Dry farming" and "Extension methods".

At the middle of the need hierarchy were the subjects like Drip irrigation, preparation and use of visual aids, conducting demonstration, post-harvest technology, operating plant protection equipments and taking of soil sample.

The subjects like talk with A.V. aids, social forestry, Livestock farming, practical method of seed treatment, kitchen gardening and efficient use of simple agricultural

implements were at the bottom of need hierarchy.

The very high weightage given to new package of practices for groundnut cultivation and plant protection might be because the groundnut is the major cash crop of the district and majority of the farmers cultivating this crop as kharif and summer crop in the study area and therefore, the VLWs may wish to improve their competency in plant protection and groundnut cultivation. so they may guide properly and solve the problems of farmers in these aspects.

### CONCLUSION

In most of the cases, the VLWs expressed their desire for practical training in the subject matter areas. Priority must be given to those subjects in which they find themselves really deficient.

### IMPLICATIONS

It is very important that before the VLWs are called for training, their training needs be ascertained so that training syllabus could be accordingly chalked out to be more meaningful and effective and thereby making the comm. patterns of VLWs more effective in transfer of new farm technology.

**Table 2 : Area-wise inservice training needs of the respondents****(N= 116)**

Sr. No.	Subject	Total choice score	Mean score	Need Hierarchy
1.	New package of practices for groundnut cultivation	309	2.67	I
2.	Plant protection	308	2.66	II
3.	Communication techniques	299	2.58	III
4.	Programme planning	297	2.56	IV
5.	Dry farming	294	2.53	V
6.	Extension Methods	291	2.51	VI
7.	Drip irrigation	284	2.45	VII
8.	Preparation and use of visual aids	284	2.45	VII
9.	Conducting demonstrations	274	2.36	IX
10.	Post harvest technology	262	2.26	X
11.	Operating plants protection equipments	262	2.26	X
12.	Taking of soil sample	259	2.23	XII
13.	Talk with A.V.Aids	248	2.14	XIII
14.	Social forestry	246	2.12	XIV
15.	Livestock farming	244	2.10	XV
16.	Practical methods of seed treatment.	244	2.10	XV
17.	Kitchen Gardening	231	1.99	XVII
18.	Efficient use of simple agric. implements.	230	1.98	XVIII