

**TITLE OF THE ARTICLE:**

**A STUDY ON KNOWLEDGE LEVEL OF KVK TRAINED VEGETABLE GROWERS**

**NAME OF THE AUTHOR: ADITYA KUMAR MALLA**

**PhD STUDENT**

**DEPARTMENT OF EXTENSION EDUCATION**

**COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE, OUAT, BHUBANESWAR**

**[EMAIL-adityamalla32@gmail.com](mailto:EMAIL-adityamalla32@gmail.com)**

**ADDRESS-ROOM NO.-203, KHARAVELA HOSTEL, HOSTEL-6, GANGA NAGAR, OUAT**

**CAMPUS, BHUBANESWAR, PIN -751003**

**A STUDY ON KNOWLEDGE LEVEL OF KVK TRAINED VEGETABLE GROWERS**

**Aditya Kumar Malla**

**email- [adityamalla32@gmail.com](mailto:adityamalla32@gmail.com)**

## **ABSTACT**

India is the second largest producer of vegetables next to China in the world accounting for about 12 per cent of world production. Vegetables play a vital role in the maintenance of human health and make the diet nutritive and balanced. The study was conducted in Begunia, Bolagarh and Khordha blocks of Khordha district, Odisha. Both purposive and random sampling procedure was followed for selection of the district, blocks, gram panchayats, villages and the respondents. The total sample size of the study was 120. The response was obtained from each individual respondent in a structured interview schedule which was pretested with 10 per cent samples other than the respondents of the study. The information from the respondents was collected by the researcher during the period of 3rd March to 15th May 2017. Thus the data collected were tabulated and subjected for empirical measurement and analysis. Krishi Vigyan Kenda (KVK) is a noble concept developed by Indian Council of Agriculture Research (ICAR) which rests upon a solid base of transfer of technology (ToT) from laboratory to farmer's field. With regards to knowledge level of vegetable growers 77.50 per cent belonged to medium knowledge level category. They had more knowledge in soil and land preparation with highest mean score 2.93. All of 13 socio-economic variables were positive and significant relationship with level of knowledge obtained from correlation study.

## **KEYWORDS:**

*Risk orientation, Innovation proneness, Cosmopoliteness, Scientific orientation*

## **ABBREVIATIONS:**

*KVK -Krishi Vigyan Kendra, TOT -Transfer of Technology, ICAR-Indian Council of Agricultural Research*

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

Odisha produces about 10.30 m.MT of horticultural produce from an area of 1.21 m.ha. and accounts for 4.28% of the total horticultural production in the country[1]. Orissa is the second largest producer of brinjal and cabbage accounting for about 20% and 14% respectively of the total production in the country[2]. The state produces 2.20 m. MT of brinjal from an area of 0.13 m ha. with productivity of 16.6 t/ha and about 1.15 m. MT of cabbage from an area of 0.04 m. ha. with productivity of 28 t/ha which is the highest among cabbage producing states[3]. The production and productivity have to be stepped up by the available knowledge, skill, advanced technology and its adoption by the vegetable growers. The need based training may improve the knowledge and skill of growers to increase production and create source of income and food. The ICAR launched several frontline transfer of technology project in the country. The Krishi Vigyan Kendra is one such scheme which was introduced by ICAR in the year 1974[4]. The objective of the KVK is to work on assessment, refinement and transfer of agricultural and allied technologies and transfer of skill through training in agriculture and allied sectors for the farmers/farmwomen of the district[5][6][7].

## **2. MATERIALS AND METHODS**

The study was conducted in Begunia, Bolagard and Khordha blocks of Khordha district. Both purposive and multistage random sampling methods were adopted for selection of the district, block, gram panchayat, village and respondents. A list of vegetable growing farmers of these selected villages was obtained from the scientists of KVK, from this list structure proportionate stratified random sampling method was followed to select respondents of the study. A total of 120 (one hundred twenty) number of respondents were selected for the purpose of the investigation. The response was obtained from each individual respondent in a structured interview schedule which was pretested with 10 per cent samples other than the respondents of the study.

### **2.1 Formulation of Hypotheses**

#### **Relationship between socio-economic profile and knowledge level of the respondents on vegetable production technology**

H<sub>0</sub>: There is no significant relationship between socio-economic profile and knowledge level of the respondents on vegetable production technology.

H<sub>1</sub>: There is existence of significant relationship between socio-economic profile and knowledge level of the respondents on vegetable production technology.

### 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

**Table-1: Distribution of respondents according to education**

**(N=120)**

The data compiled in the above table depicted that out of total respondents 20% were illiterate; whereas 13.33% received primary and middle school, 21.66% high school and 31.66 % graduate. The reason behind it was that farmers believe that getting good education will help to prosper better in future [8].

Sl. No.	Category	Frequency	Percent
1	Illiterate	24	20
2	Primary school	16	13.33
3	Middle school	16	13.33
4	High school	26	21.66
5	College & above	38	31.66
Total		120	100

**Table-2: Knowledge level of respondents on vegetable production technologies**

**(N=120)**

Knowledge level	Fully known (3)	Partially known (2)	Not known (1)	Mean Score	Rank

	f	%	f	%	f	%		
Soil and land preparation	112	93.33	8	6.66	0	0	2.93	I
Varieties	102	85	18	15	0	0	2.85	III
Planting	97	80.83	23	19.16	0	0	2.80	IV
Intercultural practices	106	88.33	14	11.67	0	0	2.88	II
Nutrient management	92	76.66	28	23.34	0	0	2.76	V
Plant protection measures	98	81.66	22	18.34	0	0	2.81	III
Harvesting	86	71.66	34	28.34	0	0	2.71	VI

A perusal of above table depicted that the respondents had sound knowledge in soil & land preparation with highest mean score 2.93, followed by plant inter cultural practices (2.88), variety (2.85) and planting (2.80); where as they had satisfactory knowledge on nutrient management (2.76). But they had somewhat poor knowledge on planting (2.71) of vegetable production.

Further an effort was undertaken to categorize the respondents basing on their knowledge level on the major areas of vegetable production, into 3 categories i.e. low, medium and high.

**Table-3: Categorization of respondents according to their knowledge level (N=120)**

Category	Frequency	Percentage
Low	12	10
Medium	93	77.50

High	15	12.50
------	----	-------

The above table indicated that among the respondents majority (77.50%) belonged to medium knowledge level category followed by high (12.50%) and low (10%) [9].

**Table-4: Relationship between socio-economic profiles with knowledge level of respondents**

**(N=120)**

<b>Sl. No.</b>	<b>Variables</b>	<b>Value of correlation coefficient (r)</b>
1.	Age	0.487*
2.	Education	0.358**
3.	Occupation	0.118
4.	Annual family income	0.142*
5.	Housing pattern	0.126
6.	Land holding size	0.157*
7.	Extent of participation	0.034
8.	Cosmopolitaness	0.028
9.	Media exposure	0.045
10.	Farm power	0.263**
11.	Risk orientation	0.152*
12.	Innovation proneness	0.282**
13.	Scientific orientation	0.186**

\*Significant at the 0.05 level of probability

\* \*Significant at the 0.01 level of probability

The data in table 4 indicates the correlation coefficient between Age ( $X_1$ ), Education ( $X_2$ ), Occupation ( $X_3$ ), Annual family income ( $X_4$ ), Housing pattern ( $X_5$ ), Land holding size ( $X_6$ ), Extent of participation ( $X_7$ ), Cosmopolitaness ( $X_8$ ), Media exposure ( $X_9$ ), Farm power ( $X_{10}$ ), Risk orientation ( $X_{11}$ ), Innovation proneness ( $X_{12}$ ) and Scientific orientation ( $X_{13}$ ) with knowledge level ( $Y_1$ ) of vegetable production technologies.

The correlation coefficient “r” between age ( $X_1$ ) and knowledge level (Y) was found to be 0.487, which showed to be significant at 0.05 level of probability. Thus, it can be concluded that age of respondents has positive significant relationship with level of knowledge of vegetable production technologies i.e. an increase in age of respondents leads to increase in the level of knowledge of vegetable production technologies. Hence null hypothesis was rejected in this case [10].

The “r” value was found to be 0.358 between education ( $X_2$ ) and knowledge level, and it was significant at 0.01 level of probability. Thus, it showed positive significant relationship of education with level of knowledge of vegetable production technologies i.e. an increase in education of respondents leads to increase in the level of knowledge of vegetable production technologies. Hence null hypothesis was rejected.

The “r” value between occupation ( $X_3$ ) and knowledge level was found to be 0.118, which was found to be non-significant at both 0.05 and 0.01 level of probability[11]. Thus, it was concluded that occupation doesn't have any positive significant relationship with level of knowledge of vegetable production technologies i.e. occupation of the respondents did not have any effect on the level of knowledge acquired. Hence null hypothesis was accepted.

The correlation coefficient “r” between annual family income ( $X_4$ ) and knowledge level was found to be 0.142, which was found to be significant at 0.05 level of probability[12]. Thus, it was concluded that annual family income has positive significant relationship with level of knowledge of vegetable production technologies i.e. the annual family income of respondents varied with the level of knowledge of vegetable production technologies acquired. Hence null hypothesis was rejected.

The “r” value was found to be 0.126 between housing pattern ( $X_5$ ) and knowledge level, which was not significant at 0.05 and 0.01 level of probability. Thus, it was concluded that housing pattern has no positive significant relationship with level of knowledge of vegetable production

technologies which means the level of knowledge of vegetable production technologies was unaffected by the housing pattern of respondents. Hence null hypothesis was accepted [13].

The correlation coefficient “r” between land holding size ( $X_6$ ) and knowledge level was found to be 0.157, which was significant at 0.05 level of probability[14]. Thus, it can be concluded that land holding size has positive significant relationship with level of knowledge of vegetable production technologies i.e. the land holding size of respondents varied with the level of knowledge of vegetable production technologies acquired by the respondents. Hence null hypothesis was rejected.

The “r” value between extent of participation ( $X_7$ ) and knowledge level was found to be 0.034 and was non-significant at both 0.05 and 0.01 level of probability. Thus, it was concluded that extent of participation has no positive significant relationship with level of knowledge of vegetable production technologies which means the level of knowledge of vegetable production technologies was unaffected by the extent of participation of respondents. Hence null hypothesis was accepted [15].

The correlation coefficient “r” between cosmopolitaness ( $X_8$ ) and knowledge level was found to be 0.028, which was non-significant at both 0.05 as well as 0.01 level of probability[16]. Thus, it was concluded that cosmopolitaness has no positive significant relationship with level of knowledge of vegetable production technologies i.e. cosmopolitaness of the respondents did not have any effect on the level of knowledge acquired by the vegetable growers. Hence null hypothesis was accepted.

The correlation coefficient “r” between media exposure ( $X_9$ ) and knowledge level was found to be 0.045, which was significant at 0.05 and 0.01 level of probability. Thus, it showed media exposure has positive significant relationship with level of knowledge of vegetable production technologies i.e. the media exposure of respondents varied with the level of knowledge of vegetable production technologies acquired by the respondents. Hence null hypothesis was rejected [17].

The correlation coefficient “r” between farm power ( $X_{10}$ ) and knowledge level was found to be 0.263, which was significant at 0.01 level of probability[18]. Thus, it was concluded that farm power has positive significant relationship with level of knowledge of vegetable production technologies i.e. an increase in farm power of respondents leads to increase in the level of knowledge of vegetable production technologies. Hence null hypothesis was rejected.



The “r” value between risk orientation ( $X_{11}$ ) and knowledge level was found to be 0.152, which was significant at 0.05 level of probability. Thus, it can be concluded that risk orientation has positive significant relationship with level of knowledge of vegetable production technologies i.e. an increase in risk orientation of respondents leads to increase in the level of knowledge of vegetable production technologies. Hence null hypothesis was rejected.

The “r” value between innovation proneness ( $X_{12}$ ) and knowledge level was found to be 0.282, which was significant at 0.01 level of probability. Thus, it showed positive significant relationship between innovation proneness and level of knowledge of vegetable production technologies i.e. the innovation proneness of respondents varied with the level of knowledge of vegetable production technologies acquired by the respondents. Hence null hypothesis was rejected [19].

The correlation coefficient “r” between scientific orientation ( $X_{13}$ ) and knowledge level was found to be 0.186, which was significant at 0.01 level of probability. Thus, it was concluded that scientific orientation has positive significant relationship with level of knowledge of vegetable production technologies i.e. an increase in scientific orientation of respondents leads to increase in the level of knowledge of vegetable production technologies. Hence null hypothesis was rejected.

#### **4. CONCLUSION**

The study indicated that a large proportion of the respondents had received college and graduate education. Medium level of knowledge had positive significant relationship with their socio-economic profile. The respondent farmers had sound knowledge in soil & land preparation with highest mean score 2.93, followed by plant inter cultural practices (2.88), variety (2.85) and planting (2.80); where as they had satisfactory knowledge on nutrient management (2.76). But they had somewhat poor knowledge on harvesting (2.71) of vegetable production. Further an effort was undertaken to categorize the respondents basing on their knowledge level on the major areas of vegetable production, into 3 categories i.e. low, medium and high. Among the respondents majority (77.50%) belonged to medium knowledge level category followed by high (12.50%) and low (10%). From the present study, it is concluded that there is a positive knowledge level of KVK trained vegetable growers. So it implies that KVK should organize such type of need based and skill oriented more training programmes and extension activities to increase the income which will ultimately uplift the socio-economic status of the farming communities in the area.

## **5. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

I feel elated and overwhelmed with rejoice to avail this opportunity to divulge my innate sense of gratitude and reverence to Dr. Aditya Prasad Kanungo, Professor, Department of Extension Education, College of Agriculture, OUAT, Bhubaneswar and Chairman of my Advisory Committee, for his meticulous guidance, persistent encouragement, noble inspiration, keen interest, amicable attitude, constructive suggestions and soothing affection throughout my studies. It was indeed a pleasure for me to work under his scholarly guidance.

I convey my heartiest thanks to all the scientists and staffs of KVK-Khordha for their help, advices and meticulous suggestion during data collection of my research work. I would like to thank the people of the study area (special thanks to Sri. Subrat Paikray), farmers involved in experiment, especially to Sri. Jatin Das (Best Horticulture farmer on state level agriculture exhibition on 2015) and other field staffs without whose cooperation the thesis would have been impossible.

I must place on record my heartiest thanks to all my dearest friends, especially Anirudha, Pooja, Subashis, Sudam; my awesome for their love, support and for providing me a memorable environment during my study. I thank to all, those who directly or indirectly helped me during my research.

## **6. REFERENCES**

1. Odisha Economic Survey, 2014 -15". Planning and Coordination Department, Government of Odisha. Retrieved 25 May 2015.
2. State-wise Per Capita Income and Gross Domestic Product at current prices:". Press Information Bureau. Retrieved 26 May 2015.
3. "Odisha achieves vegetable production growth". One India. 22 May 2015. Retrieved 8 August 2015.
4. "Agricultural Extension Division | "Indian council of Agriculture and Research". Icar.org.in. 2017-02-23. Retrieved 2018-06-23.
5. "Strengthening Agricultural Extension Activities through IARI Partnership with KVK, Muradnagar and NGO, Foundation for Agricultural Resources Management and

- Environmental Remediation (FARMER) in Ghaziabad district, UP" (PDF). [lara.res.in](http://lara.res.in). Retrieved 23 June 2018.
6. "ICAR-IIVR, Varanasi hosts partners from private seed company during Brinjal-Chilli Day - ICAR-Indian Institute of Vegetable Research". [livr.org.in](http://livr.org.in).
  7. "Role of KVK system in Agricultural Extension Programmes" (PDF). [Eeslindia.org](http://Eeslindia.org). Retrieved 23 June 2018.
  8. Ajotikar, M.V. Impact of the Adarsh Gaon Yojana implemented by Vanrai, a NGO on the socio-economic status of beneficiaries of Pune district. Ph.D. Thesis M. P .K. V Rahuri, Dist. Ahmednagar(M.S.) 2015, 4: 57-85.
  9. Pandhare, S.P. Evaluation of Krishi Vigyan Kendra under SAU Ph.D. Thesis submitted to MAU, Parbhani (M.S.) (In press) 2005.
  10. Sharma, T.N. and R.K. Singh. Impact of training on the knowledge and adoption of crop production technologie of farmerms trained by KVK, Chhindwara. National seminar on Extn. Edu. For Early 21st Century, Abstract, JNKVV, Jabalpur (M.P.), :2000,p. 56
  11. Dixit Harish and Sanjay Singh. Impact assessment of farm women training programmers with reference to Sidhi district (MP). Madhya J Extn. Edu., 2005;VIII: 87-97.
  12. Singh, A. K. Deficiencies in Agricultural Marketing and input delivery system: A view from the field. Agricultural Economics Research Review, 2012; 25:421-426.
  13. Yogananda, H.G and Narayanswamy. Rural youth training as a strategy for social change in the new millennium. National symposium on Social transformation in rural sector. Abstract, organized by Deptt. Of Agril. Extn., Econ. And Agril. Statistics, Sriniketan, Vishwabharati, West Bengal.
  14. Patel, P.K. An Impact of Tribal Sub-Plan Scheme on Tribal Community: A Sociological Study. International Journal of advanced research in management and social sciences,2000; 3(4):39-43.
  15. Barodia. A., S.K. Agrawal; M.K. Dubey and V.K. Pyasi. Factor affecting the adoption behavior of vegetable growers. Madhya J. Extn. Edu., 2005; VIII ; 29-33.
  16. Dutta, S. and Hazarika, C. Efficiency analysis of vegetable marketing in Jorhat district of Assam – A case study. Indian journal of Agricultural marketing, 2014;28(1):61-74

17. Srinivas, M.V., Venkatreddy, Y. B. and Lakshmanreddy, B. S. A study on marketing practices followed by tomato growers and source of market Information. International Journal of marketing and human resource management, 2014;5(4): 01-05.
18. Sharma, T.N.,; R.K. Singh and Tripathi. A study of socio-economic characteristics and extent of knowledge of farmers trained bu KVK, Chhindwara. J. Extn. Edu., TNAU, Coimbatore.
19. Waman, G.K.. Impact of Krishi Vigyan Kendras activities on the beneficiaries in Western Maharashtra .Ph.D thesis submitted to M.P.K.V., Rahuri(M.S) (In press) 2010.