

Research Article

Knowledge assessment of respondents in IVLP villages

■ B.A. BHAT AND HAKIM SHABIR AHMAD

ARTICLE CHRONICLE :

Received :

23.05.2013;

Revised :

25.06.2014;

Accepted :

08.07.2014

SUMMARY : The study was conducted to examine the level of knowledge of IVLP beneficiaries about the various parameters of IVLP programme implemented through Directorate of Extension Education, Chandra Shekhar Azad University of Agricultural Sciences and Technology Kanpur. A total of 300 respondents were selected for the present study from two villages where the IVLP programme was implemented. Data were collected with the help of pre-tested interview schedule. It was observed that there was a significant difference between beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries regarding their knowledge about the technological interventions of IVLP programme and as such IVLP programme made significant impact on knowledge level of respondents.

How to cite this article : Bhat, B.A. and Ahmad, Hakim Shabir (2014). Knowledge assessment of respondents in IVLP villages. *Agric. Update*, 9(3): 383-385.

KEY WORDS :

IVLP, Interventions, Beneficiaries, Non-beneficiaries, Knowledge

BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES

Experimentation and change have been the distinctive features of extension in India. Some specific rural situations developed in our country which led to rethinking in extension strategy. Millions of resource poor farmers who operate under complex, diverse and risk prone situations have not adopted many of the recommended technologies. It was realized that the effective diffusion of technologies can take place if these are appropriate and usable to the socio-economic and cultural setting of the farmers. In technology development era farmer's perspective became more important than scientists perception. Economic liberalization provided an opportunity for the country to participate in the global market. This requires both commercialization and diversification. From the results of green revolution it is well evident that agricultural development was not uniform as it was concentrated only on the well endowed areas leaving the rainfed areas in technological vacuum. In rainfed areas location specific, need based

technologies suited to individual farming system are of urgent need. IVLP in an innovation programme developed by ICAR to help scientists to have direct interaction with the farming community so that suitable technologies may be developed for the farming community which are more productive in small production system, more profitable in commercial production system and gender sensitive for removal of drudgery of farm women. The study of the impact of IVLP is concerned with the change of behaviour of the stake holders involved in the programme.

RESOURCES AND METHODS

The study was conducted after four years of implementation of IVLP programme. For carrying out this investigation two blocks of District Kanpur nagar were selected purposively and from each block one village was selected for the present study. 150 beneficiaries and 150 non-beneficiaries were selected for the present investigation. Thus, a total of 300 beneficiaries comprised the sample for the study.

Author for correspondence :

B.A. BHAT
K.V.K., BUDGAM (J&K)
INDIA

See end of the article for authors' affiliations

To get overall views of the knowledge of respondents about IVLP programme, the respondents were asked questions about the different aspects of technological interventions introduced through IVLP programme. The respondents were then categorized according to the mean scores obtained by them.

The knowledge of respondents about IVLP programme was measured in the way that in total, fourteen aspects were considered to check the knowledge of respondents about IVLP Programme. The responses of respondents were then converted into mean scores and ranked subsequently, knowledge test was administered in order to check and

compare the knowledge of beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries.

OBSERVATIONS AND ANALYSIS

It is clear from the Table 1 that among beneficiaries majority of them (44 %) had good knowledge score and only 4 per cent had poor knowledge about IVLP interventions and 52 per cent of them had average knowledge about the IVLP programme.

Among non-beneficiaries majority of them (51.33%) had poor knowledge followed by (46%) respondents who had

Table 1: Knowledge of respondents about IVLP programme

(n=300)

Category	Score range	Beneficiaries		Non-beneficiaries	
		No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage
Poor (1)	0-20	06	4.00	77	51.33
Average (2)	20-40	78	52.00	69	46.00
Good (3)	40-60	66	44.00	04	2.66
Total		150	100.00	150	100.00

Table 2 : Knowledge of respondents about crop-based interventions

(n=300)

Sr. No.	Aspects	Beneficiaries (MS)	Rank	Non-beneficiaries (MS)	Rank	"T" Value
1.	Advantages of growing HYV's of cereal crops	0.93	12	0.77	9.5	14.48
2.	Advantages of plant population management in rice and wheat	1.10	8	1.23	2	10.06
3.	Importance of weed management of cereals	1.07	10	1.00	3	3.42**
4.	Importance of IPM in rice.	1.07	4	0.77	9.5	38.72**
5.	Advantages of bio fertilizer application in rice	1.02	11	0.93	13	34.85**
6.	Significance of nutrient management in of rice wheat.	1.13	6.5	1.40	5	3.75**
7.	Disease management in rice and wheat	1.28	1	0.96	1	3.64**
8.	Management of insect pests in mustard wheat rice vegetables etc.	1.15		0.13	14	14.71**
9.	Significance of nutrient management in vegetable crops.	1.08	8.5	0.13	14	13.32**
10.	Significance of mushroom cultivation	1.21	3	0.73	4.5	37.18**
11.	Significance of zero tillage in wheat	1.05	2	0.73	11.5	34.37**
12.	Advantage of plantation in salt affected soils.	1.22	8.5	0.86	6.5	27.88
13.	Importance of training for skill enhancement	1.08	6.5	0.86	6.5	17.04**
14.	Significance of rains improved variety of rice in salt affected soils	1.13		0.83	8	21.68**
	Overall	1.15		0.84		19.64**

** indicate significance of value at P=0.01

MS = Mean score

Table 3: Knowledge of respondents about livestock based interventions

Sr.No.	Aspects	Beneficiaries		Non-beneficiaries		"t" value
		M.S.	Rank.	M.S.	Rank.	
1.	Urea feeding	1.20.	3	0.96.	1	9.03
2.	Deworming of animals	1.31.	1	0.63.	4	20.65
3.	Feeding of mineral mixture	1.24.	2	0.66.	3	16.00
4.	Artificial insemination	1.19.	4	0.53.	5	16.52
5.	Vaccination of animals	1.17.	5	0.77.	2	14.42
	Average	1.22		0.71		15.32

MS : Mean score

average knowledge about the interventions of IVLP and only 2.66 per cent among non-beneficiaries had good knowledge about IVLP interventions.

Knowledge of respondents about IVLP programme:

To get an overall view of the knowledge of respondents about IVLP programme, the respondents were asked questions about the different aspects of IVLP technological interventions. The respondents were then categorized according to the mean scores obtained by them. Podikunju (2003) studied on the Impact of agronomic interventions introduced in technology assessment and refinement under institute village linkage programme in Ajmer district of Rajasthan and Choudhary (2008) also worked on the impact of olericultural interventions introduced in technology assessment and refinement under institute village linkage programme in Ajmer district of Rajasthan.

The knowledge of respondents about IVLP programme was measured in the way that in total fourteen aspects were considered to check the knowledge of respondents about agriculture related technologies introduced through IVLP programme. The responses of the respondents were converted into mean score and ranked and then subsequently, knowledge test was administered in order to check and compare the knowledge of beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries.

It is clear from the Table 2 that beneficiaries possessed higher knowledge about disease management in rice and wheat and advantages of aonla plantation in salt affected soils, these were ranked 1 and 2, respectively. It is also noted from the table that beneficiaries had also good knowledge about significance of mushroom cultivation and insect/pest management in mustard, wheat and rice crops and were ranked 3, 4 and 5, respectively.

It is apparent from the table that non-beneficiaries had maximum knowledge about disease management of rice and wheat and also advantages of plant population management in rice and wheat and as such were ranked 1 and 2, respectively.

The table further reveals that there was a significant difference in knowledge of the respondents between beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries regarding the technologies of IVLP programme. In all components the beneficiaries had comparatively higher knowledge than the non-beneficiaries.

The findings are in line with the findings of Meena and Dashora (1999) who studied the component wise knowledge of the respondents regarding post harvest operations.

Knowledge assessment of respondents about animal husbandry related interventions of IVLP programme:

It is clear from the Table 3 that beneficiaries had highest knowledge about deworming of animals followed

by mineral mixture feeding with ranks 1 and 2, respectively. The beneficiary had also good knowledge about urea feeding and artificial insemination practice with rank 3rd and 4th, respectively. Goswami (1987) worked on the knowledge level of the livestock owners about selected animal husbandry practices.

A further look at the table reveals that in case of non-beneficiaries, they had maximum knowledge about urea feeding followed by vaccination of animals with rank 1 and 2, respectively. They had also good knowledge about mineral mixture feeding with 3rd rank.

Conclusion:

Majority of beneficiaries 52 per cent had average knowledge about the technological interventions of IVLP programme whereas majority of non-beneficiaries 51.33 per cent had poor knowledge about the technological interventions of IVLP programme. It was also observed that there was a significant difference between beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries regarding their knowledge about the technological interventions of IVLP programme. Hence, it may be concluded that IVLP programme made significant impact on knowledge level of respondents.

Authors' affiliations :

HAKIM SHABIR AHMAD, Department of Agriculture, Government of Jammu and Kashmir, BANDIPORE (J&K) INDIA

REFERENCES

- Choudhary, Prem Chand** (2008). Impact of olericultural interventions introduced in technology assessment and refinement under institute village linkage programme in Ajmer district of Rajasthan. AJMER (RAJASTHAN) INDIA.
- Goswami, A.** (1987). A study of the knowledge level of the livestock owners about selected animal husbandry practices. M.V. Sc. Thesis, *Indian Veterinary Research Institute*, Izatnagar, U.P. (INDIA).
- Meena and Dashora** (1999). An analytical study regarding post harvest operations in fruits. *New Agriculturist*, **5** (1&2): 56-60.
- Panse, V.G. and Sukhatme, P. V.** (1967). *Statistical methods for agricultural workers*. Indian Council of Agricultural Research, NEW DELHI, INDIA.
- Prasad, C.S. and Sing, K.** (2005). An assessment study in adopted villages of IVLP. *Indian J. Dairy Sci.*, **58**(1):44-48.
- Podikunju, Bindu** (2003). Impact of agronomic interventions introduced in technology assessment and refinement under Institute village Linkage Programme in Ajmer district of Rajasthan, Ph.D Thesis, Maharana Pratap University of Agriculture and Technology, Udaipur RAJASTHAN (INDIA).
- Rucker, M. and Branson, D.** (2005). A study on farmer's perception towards IPM. *Cloth. & Text. Res. J.*, **6** (4): 37-38.