International Journal of Chemical Studies

NG Patil
Ph.D. Student, Department of
Extension Education College of
Agriculture, Vasantrao Naik
Marathwada Krishi Vidyapeeth,
Parbhani, Maharashtra, India

JV Ekale
Associate Professor,
Department of Extension
Education College of Agriculture,
Vasantrao Naik Marathwada
Krishi Vidyapeeth, Parbhani,
Maharashtra, India

SP Dhoke
Ph.D. Student,
Department of Extension
Education College of Agriculture,
Vasantrao Naik Marathwada
Krishi Vidyapeeth, Parbhani,
Maharashtra, India

Study profile of beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries of KVK

NG Patil, JV Ekale and SP Dhoke

Abstract
The present study was conducted with the specific objective of "Profile beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries of KVK". For the study, KVK Aurangabad was purposively selected for present study as it is one of the oldest KVK in Aurangabad district of Marathwada region. There are nine talukas in Aurangabad district out of which three talukas were selected purposively for the study. Six adopted and six non-adopted villages with same ecological situation were purposively selected for the study. From each adopted village 15 beneficiaries were selected randomly and 15 non-beneficiaries from each non-adopted villages. Thus total sample size 180. Ex-post facto research design was adopted in this study. For this study the variables taken namely Education, Annual income, Extension contact, Economic motivation, Social participation, scientific orientation, Mass media participation, and Cosmo politeness showed significant relationship between the beneficiaries from adopted villages and non-beneficiaries from non-adopted villages at 0.01 per cent level of probability. The variables namely Age, Farming experience, Land holding showed non significant relationship between beneficiaries from adopted and non-beneficiaries from non-adopted villages at 0.05 per cent level of probability.

Keywords: Profile, beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries, KVK

Introduction
Discovery of agriculture was one of the greatest milestones in the human history which led to rise of civilizations. Agriculture, being a source of both livelihood and food security for a vast majority of our society, needs a higher priority to achieve inclusive growth. Agriculture sector covers largest segment of livelihood and plays a significant role in the overall socio-economic fabric of the nation. Agricultural research and education has been considerably advanced in this country. Research contributions in preceding decade had been enormous in all directions. The extension machinery, however, has not been able to cope up with the scientific advances. A big gap still exists between the productive technologies available and its rapid transfer to the farmers. Unless this gap is reduced, the productive technologies now available in agriculture and allied fields cannot be properly harnessed for accelerated production. It is a matter of great concern to all the Government and Non-Government organizations which are interested in and committed to agricultural advancement. In this context appropriate training of practising farmers, in –service Extension staff and the agricultural teachers and trainers is very crucial in increasing agricultural production. This aspect has received the attention of various educational institutions in varying degrees, but they seem to have suffered in terms of (a) weak subject-matter support, (b) academic approach and methods of training, (c) absence of facilities for practical training, (d) training programmes unrelated to immediate needs, (e) stress on quantity rather than quality, and (f) limited financial support for training infrastructures. To overcome these serious barriers to agricultural production, the scheme of Krishi Vigyan Kendra (KVK) was initiated by the Indian Council of Agricultural Research.

Methodology
There are total 44 KVKs working in Maharashtra out of which 11 KVKs are in Marathwada region. Out of 11 KVKs existing in Marathwada region, KVK Aurangabad was purposively selected for present study as it is one of the oldest KVK in Aurangabad district of Marathwada region. There are nine talukas in Aurangabad district out of which three talukas i.e. Aurangabad, Paithan and Gangapur were selected purposively for the study as the villages adopted by the KVK were present in these talukas. Six adopted and six non-adopted villages with same ecological situation were purposively selected after receiving list of village from

Corresponding Author:
NG Patil
Ph.D. Student, Department of
Extension Education College of
Agriculture, Vasantrao Naik
Marathwada Krishi Vidyapeeth,
Parbhani, Maharashtra, India

Krishi Vigyan Kendra. From each adopted village 15 beneficiaries were selected randomly and 15 non-beneficiaries from each non-adopted villages after receiving list from Krishi Vigyan Kendra thus constituting the size 180.Ex-post facto research design was adopted in this study, Statistically analyzed by using statistical techniques like Mean, Median, Mode, Frequency and percentage, Standard deviation, Pearson's correlation coefficient (r), Multiple regression analysis, Fisher's 'Z' Test, Path analysis. Ex-post facto research design was adopted in this study. The interview schedule based on the objectives of the study was prepared for collecting data from the respondents. The schedule was formulated in consultation with the experts in the field of extension education, by reviewing the relevant literature.

Objective
To study the profile of beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries of KVK

Results and discussion

Table 1: Distribution of the beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries of KVK According to personal and socio-economic characteristics of the respondents.

Sr. No	Category/ Characteristics	KVK beneficiaries (n=90)		KVK non- beneficiaries (n=90)		Z value
A	**Age**	No.	%	No.	%	
1	Young	18	20.00	40	44.45	1.46
2	Middle	52	57.77	42	44.67	
3	Old	20	22.23	08	08.88	
B	**Education**					
1.	Illiterate	06	6.66	12	13.33	**5.47****
2.	Can read only	04	4.45	11	12.22	
3.	Can read and write	13	14.4	08	08.88	
4.	Primary school (1st to 4th standard)	15	16.66	18	20.00	
5.	Middle school (5th to 10th standard)	20	22.23	20	22.23	
6.	Higher School(11th to 12th	23	25.55	14	15.55	
7.	Graduate	09	10.00	07	7.79	
C	**Farming experience**					
1	Low (Up to 7)	18	20.20	14	15.55	**1.42NS**
2	Medium (8 to 14)	46	51.12	44	48.89	
	High (15 & above)	26	28.88	32	35.56	
D	**land holding**					-0.46NS
1.	Marginal (Up to 1 ha.)	08	8.88	04	4.44	
2.	Small (1.1 to 2 ha.)	30	33.33	38	42.21	
3.	Semi Medium (2.1 to 4 ha.)	39	43.33	21	23.34	
4.	Medium (4.1 to 10 ha.)	12	13.34	26	28.29	
5.	Big (>10.1 ha.)	01	1.12	01	1.12	
E	**Annual income**					
1.	Low (Up to Rs.1,42,561)	14	15.55	26	28.88	2.68 **
2.	Medium (Rs. 1,42,562 to Rs.3,68,041)	15	16.67	59	65.56	
.3	High (Rs.3,68,042 & above)	61	67.78	05	05.56	
F	**Extension contact**					
1.	Low (Up to 22)	21	23.33	39	43.33	**2.60****
2.	Medium (23 to 44)	21	23.33	30	33.34	
3.	High (45 & above)	48	53.34	21	23.33	
G	**Economic motivation**					
1.	Low (Up to 12)	23	25.56	58	64.45	**4.39 ****
2.	Medium (13 to 20)	13	14.44	25	27.77	
3.	High(21 & above)	54	60.00	07	07.78	
H	**Social Participation**					
1.	Low (Up to 4)	19	21.12	79	87.78	**6.20 ****
2.	Medium (5 to 8)	25	27.77	10	11.11	
3.	High (9 & above)	46	51.11	01	01.11	
I	**Scientific Orientation**					
1.	Low (Up to 8)	08	08.88	21	21.33	**7.07 ****
2.	Medium (9 to 10)	11	12.23	49	54.45	
3.	High (11 & above)	71	78.89	20	22.22	
J	**Mass media participation**					
1.	Low (Up to 16)	17	17.89	25	27.78	**2.58 ****
2.	Medium(17 to 22)	19	21.11	39	43.33	
3.	High (23 & above)	54	60.00	26	28.89	
K	**Cosmopoliteness**					
1.	Low (Up to 16)	21	23.33	50	55.55	**5.71 ****
2.	Medium (17 to 22)	02	02.23	38	42.22	
3.	High (23 & above	67	74.44	02	02.23	

Conclusion

The distributional analysis pertaining to age of beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries of KVK 44.67 per cent of beneficiaries and 57.77 per cent of non-beneficiaries were having middle age group. The 'Z' value is non-significant indicate that there was no-significant difference in age of beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries. It was observed from the study 25.55 per cent of beneficiaries and 15.55 per cent of non-beneficiaries were having education up to high school level. The 'Z' value is significant indicate that there was significant difference in education of beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries. The study indicated that majority 51.12 per cent of the beneficiaries and 48.89 per cent of non- beneficiaries were from medium farming experience category. There was no significant difference between farming experience of beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries according to calculated 'Z' value. It was observed from the study 43.33 per cent of beneficiaries and 23.34 per cent were having 'semi-medium' land holding. The 'Z' test indicated that there was no difference in respect of land holding between beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries. It was observed from the study 67.78 per cent of beneficiaries and 5.56 per cent of non-beneficiaries had 'high' annual income. The 'Z' test indicated that beneficiaries had higher annual income as compared to non-beneficiaries. It was observed from the study majority 53.34 per cent of beneficiaries and 23.33 per non-beneficiaries had 'high' extension contact. The 'Z' value also showed that beneficiaries had more extension contact than non-beneficiaries. It was observed from the study 60.00 per cent of beneficiaries and 60.78 per cent non-beneficiaries had 'high' economic motivation. From 'Z' value it is clear that, there was significant difference between the economic motivation of beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries. It was observed from the study 51.11 per cent of beneficiaries and 1.11 per cent non-beneficiaries had 'high' social participation. From 'Z' value it is clear that, there was highly significant difference between the social participation of beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries. It was observed from the study 78.89 per cent of beneficiaries and 22.22 per cent non-beneficiaries had 'high' scientific orientation. From 'Z' value it is clear that, there was highly significant difference between the scientific orientation of beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries. It was observed from the study majority 60.00 per cent of beneficiaries and 28.89 per non-beneficiaries had 'high' mass media participation. It can be concluded from 'Z' test that beneficiaries had more mass media participation than the non-beneficiaries. It was observed from the study majority 74.44 per cent of beneficiaries and 2.23 per non-beneficiaries had 'high' cosmopoliteness. However calculated 'Z' value shows that there was high significant difference between beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries

Reference

1. Adsul Ganesh. Socio-economic impact of national horticulture mission on its beneficiaries in Marathwada region, M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis (unpublished), VNMKV, Parbhani, 2016.
2. Ahire RD, Ekale JV, Deshmukh PR. Knowledge and adoption of soil testing recommendations by the farmers in distress prone districts of Marathwada. AGRESCO, 2015, 2014-2015.
3. Bagdi GL. Demographic and Psychological Characteristics of Tribal Farmers towards Soil and Water Conservation Technologies – A Case Study of Nandurbar District of Maharashtra. Indian Journal of Extension Education. 2011; 47(1&2):98-101.
4. Bahire VV. Adoption of management practices of drip irrigation for banana in Nanded district. M. Sc. (Agri.) Thesis, MKV, Parbhani (M.S.), 2011.
5. Gaikwad JH, Khalche PG. Relationship between the adoption level and selected independent variable of sericulturist of Karnataka state, Advanced J of Social Sci. 2010; 1(2):180-181.
6. Garg, Ram Prasad. A study on technological gap about recommended chickpea production technology among growers of Sehora block of Jabalpur district (M.P.). M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis (unpublished), JNKVV, Jabalpur, 2010.