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ABSTRACT

India is the land of agriculture. Agriculture is the major livelihood and employment provider in rural areas. Maize is the third most cultivated crop after rice and wheat in India as well as Bihar. There has been large variation in production of maize since independence. Establishment of Krishi Vigyan Kendra was a main initiative take by Government. The present study “Impact of Krishi Vigyan Kendra (KVK) training on knowledge behaviour of maize growers in Bettiah block of West Champaran district of Bihar” was conducted to discern the impact of KVK training program on knowledge behaviour covering one block, five purposively selected villages and 80+40 randomly selected trainees and non-trainees. A multi-stage sampling design was used to select farmers as respondents. The primary data were collected from respondents through pre-tested interview schedule. It was found that 51.25 per cent trainees respondents had medium level of knowledge about maize production practices while in non-trainees 47.50 per cent respondents had lowest level of knowledge. The result clearly indicate that overall knowledge level of trainees was higher than non-trainees.
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Introduction

Agriculture is the most important human economic activities. In India agriculture sector provides livelihood to about 65 per cent to 70 per cent of the labour force. Training is a planned communication process caused development to bringing desirable changes in behaviour. Training of farmers has been considered as a critical input for accelerating agriculture production and transfer of technical know-how from the core of the process of agricultural development. To make training of farmers more effective and easier Indian Council of Agriculture Research establishes Krishi Vigyan Kendra in 1974 at Pondicherry. The main purpose of KVK has been imparting training, technology evaluation, impact assessments, and demonstration of technology at farmer’s field.
It is important to the impact of training programs imparted by these KVKs on adoption behaviour of respondents. So, to know the impact of KVK, a study entitled “Impact of Krishi Vigyan Kendra (KVK) training program on adoption behaviour of maize growers in Bettiah block of West Champaran district of, (Bihar) has been conducted.

Materials and Methods

The study was conducted in Bettiah block of west Champaran district of Bihar state. The Krishi Vigyan Kendra Madhepur, West Champaran which was under administrative block of Rajendra Prasad Central Agriculture University, Samastipur was selected for the study. The sample of the respondents for the study comprised of two types i.e. sample I-trained farmers (80 respondents) and sample II non-trained farmers (40 respondents) for judging between two components trainees and non-trainees. The interview schedule was developed to measure the knowledge level of respondents and adoption level of the respondents. The information collected was scored, tabulated, computed and analysed to have necessary interpretations.

Results and Discussion

The results obtained of the present study and relevant discussions have been presented under following heads:

Table.1 Socio-economic status of respondents

| Level                  | Frequency | Percentage | Level                  | Frequency | Percentage |
|------------------------|-----------|------------|------------------------|-----------|------------|
| Lowest level (29-36)   | 27        | 33.75      | Lowest level (11-16)   | 13        | 32.50      |
| Medium level (37-44)   | 41        | 51.25      | Medium level (19-26)   | 18        | 45.00      |
| High level (45-52)     | 12        | 15.00      | High level (27-34)     | 9         | 22.50      |
| Total                  | 80        | 100.00     | Total                  | 40        | 100.00     |

Above table indicates that about 51.25 per cent respondents had medium socio-economic status followed by 33.75 per cent low level of socio-economic status and 15 per cent high socio-economic status respectively in trainees categories while in non-trainees 45.00 per cent respondents had medium socio-economic status followed by 45.00 per cent had low socio-economic status and 22.50 per cent respondents had high socio-economic status.

Table.2

| Level                  | Frequency | Percentage | Level                  | Frequency | Percentage |
|------------------------|-----------|------------|------------------------|-----------|------------|
| Lowest level (32-40)   | 28        | 35.00      | Lowest level (22-27)   | 19        | 47.50      |
| Medium level (41-48)   | 41        | 51.25      | Medium level (28-32)   | 16        | 40.00      |
| High level (49-56)     | 11        | 13.75      | High level (33-37)     | 5         | 12.50      |
| Total                  | 80        | 100.00     | Total                  | 40        | 100.00     |
Above table shows level of trainees and non-trainees respondents in respect of maize production technology. Table clearly define that 51.25 per cent respondents had medium level of knowledge followed by 35.00 per cent respondents had low level of knowledge and rest 13.75 per cent respondents had high level of knowledge about maize production technology in trainees categories. While in non-trainees 47.5 per cent respondents had low level of knowledge followed by 40.00 per cent respondents had medium level of knowledge and rest 12.50 per cent respondents had high level of knowledge about maize production.

**Relationship between characteristics of farmers with adoption level:**

| Independent variable                  | ‘r” value |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| 1 X1 Age                              | -0.369**  |
| 2 X2 Education                       | 0.516**   |
| 3 X3 Land holding                     | 0.021 N S |
| 4 X4 Occupation                       | 0.296     |
| 5 X5 Annual income                    | 0.013 N S |
| 6 X6 Extension contact                | 0.259**   |
| 7 X7 Sources of agriculture information | 0.295   |
| 8 X8 Channel of agriculture information | 0.231   |

* =Significant at 0.05 % level
**= Significant at 0.01 % level

It was observed from the table 3 that age had shown negatively and significant relationship with knowledge of maize production technology. Education is positively and significantly related with knowledge maize production technology. Land holding is positively and significantly related with knowledge of maize production technology.

Occupation is positively and significantly related with knowledge of maize production technology. Annual income is positively and significantly related with knowledge of maize production technology. Extension contact participation is positively and significantly related with knowledge of maize production technology.

Sources of agriculture information are positively and significantly related with knowledge of maize production technology. Channel of agriculture information is positively and significantly related with knowledge of maize production technology. It is due to their background and other exposure. The findings are in the line.

It is concluded that majority of the respondents have medium level of socio-economic status and majority of the respondents have medium level of knowledge of maize production technology.

Respondents Age had shown negatively and significant relationship with knowledge of maize production technology and education, occupation, annual income, extension contact, sources of agriculture information and channel of agriculture information had shown is positively and significantly related with
knowledge of maize production technology. Hence it is concluded that knowledge level of trainees was higher than knowledge level of non-trainees respondents.
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