

IMPACT OF KVK ACTIVITIES IN ADOPTED VILLAGES OF KVK-DANG

J.B.Dobariya¹, N.M.Thesiya² and V.K.Desai³

1, 2 & 3 Krishi Vigyan Kendra,NAU, Waghai Dist. Dang - 394030

Email : dobariyajignesh@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

The present study was conducted in dang district of Gujarat state. 12 Village of which 120 respondents, 10 from each village were purposively selected from Waghai, ahwa and subir taluka by random sampling techniques. The impact of KVK activities in adopted villages have shown by the result changes occurred due to adoption and knowing of recommended agricultural technologies which are disseminated by KVK in the form of changes those prospered within the beneficiary farmers of adopted village of KVK. It evident from the research that beneficiary farmer had significantly higher knowledge and better adoption about improved agricultural technologies of gram crop as compare to non beneficiary farmer. Yield data of the crop clearly suggest that respondent from beneficiary farmer group had higher average yield of gram crop than non beneficiary farmer group. From the finding an inference could be drawn that KVK had played an important role in increasing knowledge and the rate of adoption of improved agricultural technologies of gram crop. This may be due to the fact that farmer might have been motivated through tremendous benefits of KVK activities.

Keywords : kvk, activities, impact

INTRODUCTION

Technical breakthrough in agriculture research in recent year has provided with immense opportunities to increase agricultural production will depend on our ability to involve a large numbers of farmers and to impact them with the knowledge and skills necessary for the large scale use of new agricultural technology and inputs in an intensive manner. Keeping this fact in view, many Krishi Vigyan Kendras have been started all over the country. Organizing “Front Line Demonstrations (FLDs) and On Farm Testing (OFT)” on various crops to generate production data and feedback information is one of the mandates of KVKs. The transfer of modern agricultural practices to the farmers with pre-conceived thought of traditional farming calls for a well developed and organized training programmes for the farmers. Training is a critical input for quick transfer of technology and a way to improve their agriculture and to uplift their socio economic condition. Other extension activities carried out by the KVK was also important in TOT. Keeping this in view, it was felt worthwhile to study “The impact of KVK activities in adopted villages of KVK-Dang”.

OBJECTIVES

(a) To study the profile of the respondents

(b) To know the impact of KVK activities in adopted villages of KVK-Dang

(c) To ascertain the relationship between dependent and independent variables

METHODOLOGY

The present study was conducted in dang district of Gujarat. For the purpose of this study, 12 Villages of Waghai, Ahwa and Subir taluka were selected purposively from dang district to conduct the study by following the random sampling methods. A total sample of 120 respondents, 10 from each village was selected at random for the study with the help of random sampling methods. The information of each respondents was collected with the help of pre tested, structured interview schedule by personal interview. The collected data were analyzed and interpreted in the light of the objectives with appropriate statistical tools like percentage, rank, mean and standard deviation. The impact of KVK activities in adopted villages have shown by comparing the tables. The resultant changes occurred due to main two activities like FLD and training carried out by the personnel of KVKs. Moreover, an adoption and knowledge of recommended agricultural technologies was one of the means accounts as impact of FLD and Training. It was

define as the resultant changes occurred due to adoption and knowing of recommended agricultural technologies which are disseminated by KVK in the form of changes those prospered within the beneficiary farmers of adopted village of KVK

RESULTS AND DISSCUSSION

The outcome of the present study has been presented here after applying the appropriate statistical analysis. The

results have been described under the following sub heads in the light of the objectives of the study.

Socio-economic and personal characteristics of the respondents

The data regarding socio-economic and personal characteristics of respondents were analyzed and presented in the following sequence.

Table 1 :Distribution of respondents according to their Characteristics

n= 120

	Particular/category	Beneficiary(n=60)	Non beneficiary(n=60)
		Frequency (%)	Frequency (%)
A	Age		
	1. Young age	08(13.00%)	04(07.00%)
	2. Middle age	37(62.00%)	31(52.00%)
	3. Old age	15(25.00%)	25(41.00%)
B	Education		
	1. Illiterate	02(03.00%)	05(08.00%)
	2. Primary level of education	30(50.00%)	25(42.00%)
	3. Secondary and Higher secondary level of education	26(44.00%)	27(45.00%)
	4. College level of education and above	02(03.00%)	03(05.00%)
C	Land holding		
	1. Small & marginal farmer	22(37.00%)	20(33.00%)
	2. Medium farmer	17(28.00%)	18(30.00%)
	3. Big farmer	21(35.00%)	22(37.00%)
D	Family size		
	1. Small size of family (Up to 5 members)	24(40.00%)	23(38.00%)
	2. Medium size of family (6 to 8 members)	26(43.00%)	31(52.00%)
	3. Large size of family(Above 8 members)	10(17.00%)	06(10.00%)
E	Social participation		
	1. No membership	15(25.00%)	20(33.00%)
	2. Membership in one organization	18(30.00%)	28(47.00%)
	3. Membership in more than one organization	27(45.00%)	12(20.00%)
F	Information input behavior		
	1. Low	11(18.00%)	16(27.00%)
	2. Medium	32(53.00%)	35(58.00%)
	3. High	17(29.00%)	09(15.00%)
G	Farming experience		
	1. Lower level of farming experience(Up to 5 years)	02(03.00%)	02(03.00%)
	2. Medium level of farming experience(6 to 10 years)	16(27.00%)	11(18.00%)
	3. Higher level of farming experience(Above 10 years)	42(70.00%)	47(79.00%)
H	Animal possession		
	1. Having no animal	06(10.00%)	01(02.00%)
	2. Up to 3 animal	13(22.00%)	19(32.00%)
	3. 4 to 6 animal	12(20.00%)	21(35.00%)
	4. Above 6 animal	29(48.00%)	19(31.00%)
I	Extension participation		
	1. Low	12(20.00%)	10(17.00%)
	2. Medium	36(60.00%)	45(75.00%)
	3. High	12(20.00%)	05(08.00%)

J	Innovativeness		
	1. Low	02(03.00%)	05(08.00%)
	2. Medium	38(63.00%)	52(37.00%)
	3. High	20(34.00%)	03(05.00%)
K	Economic Motivation		
	1. Low level of economic motivation	11(18.00%)	11(18.00%)
	2. Medium level of economic motivation	28(47.00%)	35(58.00%)
	3. High level of economic motivation	21(35.00%)	14(24.00%)
L	Scientific orientation		
	1. Low level of scientific orientation	13(22.00%)	21(35.00%)
	2. Medium level of scientific orientation	30(50.00%)	39(65.00%)
	3. High level of scientific orientation	17(28.00%)	00(00.00%)

The data in Table 1 revealed that 62.00 per cent of beneficiary and 52.00 per cent of non beneficiary farmers belonged to middle age group, 50.00 per cent of beneficiary and 42.00 per cent of non beneficiary farmers had educated up to primary level, 37.00 per cent beneficiary farmer possessed Small and marginal land holding, while Same percent of non beneficiary farmers, had big land holding, near half of the beneficiary and non beneficiary farmers (43.00 % and 52.00%, respectively) had medium family size, near about one half of beneficiary farmers (45.00%) had belonged to membership in more than one organization, Whereas, 47.00 per cent of non beneficiary farmer had membership in one organization. In case of Information input behavior the result seen in Table1 portrays that more than one half of beneficiary and non beneficiary farmers (53.00% & 58.00% respectively) had moderate information input behavior, majority 70.00 percent of beneficiary and 79.00 percent of non beneficiary farmers had above 10 years of experience in farming, 48.00 per cent of beneficiary farmers had above 6 animals and 35.00 per cent of non beneficiary farmer had 4 to 6 animal, two third of beneficiary farmers (60.00%) and three fourth of non beneficiary farmer (75.00%) had moderate extension participation. It is evident from Table 1 that slightly more than half (63.00 per cent) of the

beneficiary farmer and 87 per cent of non beneficiary farmer had medium level of innovativeness, near about one half of beneficiary farmers (47.00%) and more than half (58.00%) of non beneficiary farmer had medium level of economic motivation. A glance at Table 1 revealed that exactly half of beneficiary farmers (50.00%) and nearly two third of non beneficiary farmers(65.00%) had medium level of scientific orientation.

Impact of KVK activity like FLD and training

The knowledge of an innovation is prerequisite for adoption. A higher knowledge of scientific methods of improve practices will lead to a higher adoption possibility. KVK is playing importance role in improving the knowledge of improve agricultural practices through FLD, OFT and training activities. In the present study knowledge refers to know how about different improved agricultural technologies of gram crop possessed by the farmers. For analyses of rate of adoption the respondent asked to give the account of package of practices they followed in gram cultivation. Adoption quotient of gram crop for each respondent calculated and they were classified into three categories of adoption vise. The data about level of knowledge, adoption and yield are given in Table 2.

Table 2 : Distribution of BF and NBF as per their dependent characteristics about improved agricultural technologies of gram crop n=120

Particular/category	Beneficiary (n=60)	Non beneficiary (n=60)
	Frequency (%)	Frequency (%)
Knowledge:	Mean-29.48 SD-7.00	Mean 24.73 SD—6.79
1.Low(Up to 22 score)	06(10.00%)	Up to 18 score: 11(18.00%)
2.Medium(23 to 36)	43(72.00%)	19 to 31 :47(78.00%)
3.High(Above 36)	11(18.00%)	Above 31 :02(04.00%)
Adoption:	Mean-27.00 SD-3.02	Mean 20.97 SD-2.67
1.Low(Up to 23 score)	05(08.00%)	Up to 18 score: 19(32.00%)
2.Medium(24 to 30)	41(68.00%)	18 to24 :30(50.00%)
3.High(Above 30)	14(24.00%)	Above 24 : 11(18.00%)
Yield: kg/ha	Mean-1000 SD-50	Mean 932.5 SD-62.5
1.Low(up to 950 kg)	17(28.00%)	Up to 870 kg: 35(58.00%)
2.Medium(951to1050)	22(37.00%)	871 to 995 :17(28.00%)
3.High(Above 1050)	21(35.00%)	Above 995 :08(14.00%)

It can be presented from Table 2 that majority (72 per cent) of beneficiary farmer had medium level of knowledge about improved agricultural technologies of gram crop; followed by 18 per cent and 10 per cent farmer had higher and lower level of knowledge about improved agricultural technologies of gram crop respectively. In case of non beneficiary farmer majority (78 per cent) of them had medium level of knowledge about improved agricultural technologies of gram crop, followed by 18 per cent and 04 per cent of them had low and high level of knowledge about improved agricultural technologies of gram crop, respectively.

The analysis of data showed that great majority of beneficiary (92.00 per cent) of farmer had medium to high level of adoption and in case of non beneficiary farmer (82.00 per cent) had medium to low level of adoption about improved agricultural technologies of gram crop. It means this may be perhaps due to positive impact of KVK.

A perusal of the table 2 indicated that 37.00 per cent of beneficiary farmers had medium level of yield, followed by 35.00 per cent and 28.00 per cent of them had high and low level of yield, respectively. In case of non-beneficiary farmer, majority (58.00 per cent) of them had low level of yield, followed by 28.00 per cent and 14.00 per cent of them had medium and high level of yield, respectively. It can be concluded that the farmers those who had beneficiary farmers having more yield. Results are in line with the Vinaya *et al.*, (2015) and Soni *et al.*, (2016).

Comparison between groups

The ‘t’ value was calculated to examine whether there was any significant difference in level of knowledge and adoption about improved agricultural technologies of gram crop between beneficiary and non beneficiary farmer. The detail analysis was carried out in this regard which is presented in table 3 and 4

Table 3 : Comparison between beneficiary and non beneficiary farmer in respect of their knowledge about improved agricultural technologies of gram crop n=120

Categories of respondents	Number	Mean score of knowledge	Standard deviation	‘t’ value
Beneficiary farmer	60	39.48	7.007	3.6181**
Non beneficiary farmer	60	24.73	6.79	

**significant at 1 per cent probability level

It evident from Table 3 , ‘t’ value (3.6181) was found to be significant at 0.01 level of significant indication thereby that beneficiary farmer had significantly higher knowledge about improved agricultural technologies of gram crop as compare to non beneficiary farmer. Also the mean score of knowledge is higher in beneficiary farmers than those of non

beneficiary farmers.

From the above finding an inference can be drawn that KVK activities had influenced in increasing the knowledge of the beneficiary farmers about improved agricultural technologies of gram crop.

Table 4 : Comparison between beneficiary and non beneficiary farmer in respect of their adoption about improved agricultural technologies of gram crop. n=120

Categories of respondents	Number	Mean score of knowledge	Standard deviation	‘t’ value
Beneficiary farmer	60	27.00	3.02	2.964**
Non beneficiary farmer	60	20.97	2.67	

**significant at 1 per cent probability level

The ‘t’ value shown (2.964) in Table 4 reveals that there was highly significant difference in the adoption about improved agricultural technologies of gram crop between the beneficiary and non beneficiary farmers.

technologies of gram crop

In order to find out the relationship between the selected characteristics of beneficiary and non beneficiary farmers and their level of knowledge and adoption of improved agricultural technologies of gram crop, correlation was worked out the finding are presented in Table 5

Relationship between the selected characteristic of beneficiary and non beneficiary farmers with their knowledge and adoption of improved agricultural

Table 5 : Relationship between knowledge of improved agricultural technologies of gram and okra crop and independent variable of beneficiary and non beneficiary farmers. n=120

Sr. No.	Variable	Correlation-coefficient (Knowledge)		Correlation-coefficient (Adoption)	
		Beneficiary (n=60)	Non Beneficiary (n=60)	Beneficiary (n=60)	Non Beneficiary (n=60)
X ₁	Age	-0.298*	-0.054	0.262	0.466
X ₁	Education	-0.029	-0.1429	0.849	0.142
X ₂	Land holding	0.1175	-0.0546	0.156	0.057
X ₃	Family size	-0.1013	-0.0098	0.411	0.125
X ₄	Social participation	0.3625**	0.1234	0.004**	0.0001**
X ₅	Information input behavior	0.049	-0.0827	0.646	0.003**
X ₆	Farming experience	-0.046	0.01961	0.679	0.761
X ₇	Animal possession	0.1586	0.0923	0.233	0.417
X ₈	Extension participation	0.3183*	0.0385	0.003**	0.087
X ₉	Innovativeness	-0.3588**	-0.0036	0.008**	0.656
X ₁₀	Economic motivation	0.1206	0.0240	0.279	0.001**
X ₁₁	Scientific orientation	0.1657	0.0034	0.935	0.957

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

The analysis of data showed that four variable age, social participation, extension participation and innovativeness of beneficiary farmer were observing significant with their knowledge of improved agricultural technologies of gram crop. Same way three variables like social participation extension participation and innovativeness of beneficiary farmer were observing significant with their adoption of improved agricultural technologies of gram crop. While no any significant relationship was observed under non beneficiary farmer with their knowledge of improved agricultural technologies of gram crop but three variables like social participation, information input behavior, economic motivation were observing significant with their adoption of improved agricultural technologies of gram crop.

CONCLUSION

It evident from the research that beneficiary farmer had significantly higher knowledge about improved agricultural technologies of gram crop as compare to non beneficiary farmer so KVK activities had influenced in increasing the knowledge of the beneficiary farmers about improved agricultural technologies of gram crop. Highly significant difference in the adoption about improved agricultural technologies of gram crop showed that the beneficiary farmer had better adoption than non beneficiary farmer in improved agricultural technologies of gram crop. Yield data of the crop clearly suggest that respondent from beneficiary farmer group had higher average yield of gram crop than non beneficiary farmer group. From the above finding an inference could be drawn that KVK had played an

important role in increasing knowledge, the rate of adoption and yield of improved agricultural technologies of gram crop.

REFERENCES

Dhaneshwar sai (2008). Impact of Krishi Vigyan Kendra, Devtaj on the farmers of anand district. Ms.C. thesis, B.A.College of agriculture, Gujarat

Singh, K, (1977). A study of neo marginal farmers and socio economic impact of new agricultural technology, Ph.D thesis, IARI, New Delhi

Soni, Arti N., Pandya, C.D. and Soni, D.N. (2016). Impact of Front Line Demonstration on Feeding of low cost high protein rich food (POSHAK AAHAR) to malnourished rural tribal children. *Guj. J. Ext. Edu.*, 27(1): 79-81.

Supe, S.V. (1969). "Value Scales". Hand book of psychological and social instruments. I.I.M., Ahmedabad, pp.306-308

Venkataramaiah, p. (1983). Development of socio-economic status scale for rural area Ph.D. thesis, Univ. of Agril. Sci., Bangalore

Vinaya Kumar, H. M., Yashodhara.B., Preethi and Govinda Gowda, V. (2015). Impact of Community Based Tank Management Project on Socio-Economic Status and Crop Productivity of Beneficiary Farmers in Tumkur District of Karnataka State. *Trends in Biosciences*. 8(9): 2289-2295