



Profile Characteristics of the Farmers in the Adopted and Non-adopted Villages of Krishi Vigyan Kendra, Amadalavalasa in Srikakulam

A Manoj, G Sivanarayana, Ch Ramesh Babu and V Srinivasa Rao

Department of Extension Education, Agricultural College, Bapatla 522 101, Andhra Pradesh

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted to assess the difference between the profile characteristics of the farmers in the adopted and non-adopted villages of KVK. Results revealed that there was a significant difference between the farmers of adopted and non-adopted villages regarding mass media exposure, extension contact, risk orientation, economic orientation, achievement motivation and innovativeness except the education and landholding.

Key words : Adopted Village, Farmers, Krishi Vigyan Kendra, Non-adopted Village, Profile Characteristics

The process of agriculture development is now in its dynamic stage subjecting everything to change, as the result, the role of extension agencies became pivotal. Today's agriculture extension mainly focuses on location specific, need based technology development involving farmers in participatory mode. The farmer's ideas must be taken into account by the scientists to develop technology for better adoption suiting to their farming situation. Research studies have revealed that the profile characteristics of farmers are having a great contribution in the extent of participation of farmers in the development programmes and in seeking advanced technology from research institutes. Considering the above facts in a view, the present study was planned with a specific objective to study the difference between the farmers of adopted and non-adopted villages of KVK regarding the profile characteristics.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

The study was conducted by following ex-post-facto research design in purposively selected four villages in the purposively selected two mandals of Srikakulam district of Andhra Pradesh. A sample of 80 farmers selected 40 from adopted villages and 40 from non-adopted villages. Data was collected through a well structured interview schedule. The collected data was coded, classified and tabulated. Finally, 'Z' test, mean, standard deviation, frequency and percentage, were used for drawing conclusions.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Table 1 clearly revealed that majority (30.00%) of the farmers of adopted villages were illiterate

followed by an equal number (22.50%) of farmers with primary and secondary education, 15 per cent had intermediate and remaining 10 per cent had degree education. In case of non-adopted villages, majority (37.50%) of the farmers were illiterate followed by secondary education (22.50%), primary education (15.00%) and an equal number (12.50%) of respondents had intermediate and degree education.

This result might be due to lack of education facilities in the village and subsistence economy of the farming community in both adopted and non-adopted villages. It is, therefore, necessary to establish education centers in villages to improve their literacy level. This was in line with the findings of Swaroopa Rani (2000).

It was observed from the Table 1 that the majority (55.00%) of the respondents of adopted villages were small farmers followed by big farmers (32.50%) and marginal farmers (12.50%). In case of non-adopted villages, majority (60.00%) of the respondents were small farmers, followed by marginal (32.50%) and big farmers (7.50%).

This trend of farmers in adopted villages of KVK having small to big farmers when compared with small to marginal farmers in non-adopted villages due to the profitability of technology spread by KVK. This trend also witnessed by Ravishankar (2002).

Table 1 clearly showed that majority (62.50%) of the farmers in adopted villages had medium level of social participation followed by the remaining with high (27.50%) and low (10.00%) levels of social participation. In case of non-adopted villages, majority (50.00%) of the farmers had medium level of social participation followed by low (35.00%) and

Table 1 Distribution of the respondent according to their profile characteristics

S.No	Categorization of Variables	Adopted villages		Non-adopted villages		Z value
		Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	
1	Education					
	Illiterate	12	30.00	15	37.50	0.16 NS
	Primary education	9	22.50	6	15.00	
	Secondary education	9	22.50	9	22.50	
	Intermediate	6	15.00	5	12.50	
	Degree	4	10.00	5	12.50	
2	Land holding					
	Marginal farmers	5	12.50	13	32.50	1.73 NS
	Small farmers	22	55.00	24	60.00	
	Big farmers	13	32.50	3	7.50	
3	Social participation					
	Low	4	10.00	14	35.00	4.80**
	Medium	25	62.50	20	50.00	
	High	11	27.50	6	15.00	
4	Mass media exposure					
	Low	10	25.00	13	32.50	3.61**
	Medium	18	45.00	19	47.50	
	High	12	30.00	8	20.00	
5	Extension contact					
	Low	6	15.00	6	15.00	6.85**
	Medium	23	57.50	28	70.00	
	High	11	27.50	6	15.00	
6	Risk orientation					
	Low	10	25.00	12	30.00	4.40**
	Medium	15	37.50	18	45.00	
	High	15	37.50	10	25.00	
7	Scientific orientation					
	Low	8	20.00	14	35.00	4.18**
	Medium	20	50.00	16	40.00	
	High	12	30.00	10	25.00	
8	Economic orientation					
	Low	6	15.00	17	42.50	2.17**
	Medium	26	65.00	17	42.50	
	High	8	20.00	6	15.00	
9	Achievement motivation					
	Low	5	12.50	7	17.50	2.98**
	Medium	27	67.50	20	50.00	
	High	8	20.00	13	32.50	
10	Innovativeness					
	Low	10	25.00	14	35.00	3.31**
	Medium	15	37.50	16	40.00	
	High	15	37.50	10	25.00	

high (15.00 %) levels of social participation. Whereas, the inclination of non- adopted village farmers undergo little motivation they derived because of lack of awareness of activities of various social organizations. The inclination of the farmers in adopted villages towards higher participation might be due to pivotal role played by the KVKs through the varieties of the activities like to aiming on-campus and off-campus programmes because they become aware of the importance of various social organizations for their socio-economic uplift. This could be the reason for the significant difference between the farmers of adopted and non-adopted villages regarding social participation. This result was in line with the results of Manjunatha (2002).

It was clear from the Table 1 that majority (45.00%) of the farmers had medium level of mass media exposure followed by high (30.00%) and low (25.00%) levels of mass media exposure. In case of non-adopted village, majority (47.50%) of the farmers had medium level of mass media exposure followed by low (32.50%) and high (20.00%) levels of mass media exposure.

The above results showed that the farmers of adopted villages had higher level of exposure to mass media than the farmers of non-adopted villages. This might be due to the fact that farmers of KVK adopted villages had their mass media sources like radio, television and subscribed agricultural magazine *viz.*, Annadata, Padipantalu, Rythu Nestam and books like Vyavasaya Panchangam for more up to date information because of higher scientific orientation developed due to various village adoption activities of KVK. This type of favourable climate would have made them to have high exposure towards mass media. This finding was in conformity with the findings of Pandey and Mehta (2002).

It was evident from the Table 1 that majority (57.50%) of the farmers of the adopted villages had medium extension contact followed by high (27.50%) and low (15.00%) extension contact. In case of non-adopted villages majority (70.00%) of the farmers had medium extension contact followed by equal number (15.00%) of the farmers with low and high extension contact.

From the above result, it could be inferred that the farmers of adopted villages had higher level of extension contact than the farmers of non-adopted villages. This would have been due to the intimacy developed with KVK scientists because of their village being under adoption lead them they have medium to high extension contact out of the confidence that

they have developed. Whereas, the farmers of non-adopted villages have medium to low extension contacts with the scientists of KVK. This due to lack of any motivation force to interact with extension agents except at the time of distributing the subsidies, because of this, they depend on personal localite source of information. This could be the reason for the significant difference between the farmers of adopted and non-adopted villages regarding extension contact. These findings are in tune with the results of Prashanthkumar (2007).

It was observed from the Table 1 that equal number (37.50%) of the farmers of adopted villages were having medium and high level of risk orientation followed by low (25.00%) levels of risk orientation. Whereas, in non-adopted villages majority (45.00%) of the farmers were having medium level of risk orientation followed by low (30.00%) and high (25.00%) levels of risk orientation.

This result indicates that the farmers of adopted villages had higher level of risk orientation than the farmers of non-adopted villages. This might be due to their increased awareness about the characteristic features of innovation coupled with large sized land holding and financial resources that lead them to accept new technologies and have high risk orientation of farmers in adopted villages when compared to the medium to low level of risk orientation of farmers in non-adopted villages of KVK. This result is in conformity with the result of Manjunatha (2002).

It could be inferred from Table 1 that majority (50.00%) of the respondents of adopted villages were having medium level of scientific orientation followed by high (30.00%) and low (20.00%) levels of scientific orientation. In case of non-adopted villages, majority (40.00%) of the respondents were having medium level of scientific orientation followed by low (35.00%) and high (25.00%) levels of scientific orientation.

From the above result, it was concluded that majority of the farmers of adopted village had higher level of scientific orientation than the farmers of non-adopted villages. This might be due to the knowhow and do how of new technology that is being provided to adopted village farmers which helped them to analyze the ideas before putting them into practice. This would have been the possible reason for the farmers in adopted villages to develop with high scientific orientation. Whereas the farmers of non-adopted villages on the other hand gets information about new ideas in agriculture at a later time and

may not find time to systematically analyze the ideas and put the ideas haphazardly. Moreover, low risk orientation among them would have been a limiting factor to develop scientific attitude towards agriculture, which might be leading to low scientific orientation. This is the reason for the significant difference between the farmers of adopted and non-adopted villages regarding scientific orientation. This similar finding was reported by Chaudhari (2006).

It was evident from Table 1 that majority (65.00%) of the respondents of adopted villages had medium level of economic orientation followed by high (20.00%) and low (15.00%) levels of economic orientation. Whereas, in case of non-adopted villages equal number (42.50%) of the respondents had low and medium levels of economic orientation followed by high (15.00%) level of economic orientation.

This result indicates that the farmers of adopted village had higher level of economic orientation than the farmers of non-adopted villages. This might be due to their knowledge on the consequences of the innovation developed due to their exposure to various awareness generations activities of KVK. This would have caused high economic orientation on the part of the farmers of adopted village than the farmers of non-adopted villages. This could be the reason for the significant difference between the farmers of adopted and non-adopted villages regarding economic orientation.

It was evident from the Table 1 that majority (67.50%) of the respondents of adopted villages were having medium level of achievement motivation followed by high (20.00%) and low (12.50%) levels of achievement motivation. In case of non-adopted villages, majority (50.00%) of the respondents were having medium level of achievement motivation followed by high (32.50%) and low (17.50%) levels of achievement motivation.

This might be due to the continuous guidance provided by KVK scientists on scientific lines to farmers to farmers that helped them to have high scientific orientation resulting in high achievement motivation than farmers of non-adopted villages. This might be the reason for the significant difference between the farmers of adopted and non-adopted villages regarding achievement motivation. This result is in agreement with the result of Ravichandraprasad (2002).

It was observed from Table 1 that equal number (37.50%) of the respondents of adopted villages were having both medium and high levels of innovativeness followed by low (25.00%) levels of innovativeness. In case of non-adopted villages, majority (40.00%) of the respondents were having medium level of innovativeness followed by low (35.00%) and high (25.00%) levels of innovativeness.

From above the results, it was observed that the farmers of adopted villages had higher level of innovativeness than the farmers of non-adopted villages. This might be due to easy accessibility to sources of innovation resulting in high scientific orientation coupled with high risk orientation lead them to adoption of innovations than the farmers of non-adopted villages. This could be the reason for the significant difference between the farmers of adopted and non-adopted villages regarding innovativeness. Similar results were reported by Parthasarathi (1997) and Prashanthkumar (2007).

From the above findings it could be concluded that there was shift in the profile characteristics from medium to high in adopted villages of KVK when compared to medium to low profile characteristics of farmers in non-adopted villages of KVK. Hence the role KVK need to be further amplified to facilitate them to take advantages of recent technologies to be communicated by various agencies because of greater level of understanding that they have developed at the instance of KVK.

LITERATURE CITED

- Chaudhari R R 2006.** A study on entrepreneurial behavior of dairy farmers. Ph.D Thesis, University of Agricultural Sciences, Dharwad.
- Manjunatha 2002.** Impact of irrigation on annual income and employment generation in Hemavathi Irrigation Project Area: A comparative analysis. M.Sc (Ag.) Thesis, University of Agricultural Sciences, Dharwad.
- Pandey R and Mehta S 2002.** Extent and use of educational technology by distant learners. *Journal of Communication Studies* 20 (1): 78-82.
- Parthasarathi S 1997.** A Study on the impact of rice Farmer's Field School among trained and untrained farmers. M.Sc (Ag.) Thesis, Annamalai University, Annamalinagar.

- Prashanthkumar T V R R 2007.** A study on the knowledge and adoption of AMC level trained and un-trained farmers in Mahaboobnagar district of Andhra Pradesh. M.Sc (Ag.) Thesis, Acharya N.G.Ranga Agricultural University, Hyderabad.
- Ravichandraprasad C 2002.** A study on the Impact of On-Farm Extension Demonstrations (OFEDs) in rice in Nellore district of Andhra Pradesh. M.Sc (Ag.) Thesis, Acharya N.G. Ranga Agricultural University, Hyderabad.
- Ravishankar 2000.** A comparative study of Krishi Vigyan Kendras (KVKs) of governmental organizations and Non-governmental organizations in Kurnool district of Andhra Pradesh. M.Sc (Ag.) Thesis, Acharya N.G. Ranga Agricultural University, Hyderabad.
- Swaroop Rani J 2000.** A study on the impact of JRY in Nizamabad district of Andhra Pradesh. M.Sc (Ag.) Thesis, Acharya N.G. Ranga Agricultural University, Hyderabad.

(Received on 28.02.2009 and revised on 05.05.2009)