

## Original Research Article

# Knowledge of Farmers towards Different Activities of Agricultural Technology Management Agency (ATMA) in East Champaran District of Bihar

Shalini<sup>1\*</sup>, Deepak Kumar Bose<sup>1</sup>, Bipul kumar<sup>2</sup> and Appu raja<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Agricultural Extension and Communication  
SHUATS Pragyagraj, India

<sup>2</sup>Department of Extension Education, RPCAU, Pusa, Samastipur, India

<sup>3</sup>Department of Agronomy Student, Rama University, Kanpur, India

*\*Corresponding author*

## ABSTRACT

Agricultural Technology Management Agency (ATMA) was registered as an autonomous institution and at it is implemented in all the 38 districts of the state. The concept of ATMA envisages a paradigm shift from "top-down" to "bottom-up" in planning and implementation of agriculture development programmes. The present study was conducted in East Champaran district of Bihar to assess the level of knowledge towards the different activities of ATMA. Results revealed that Majority of beneficiaries have Medium level of knowledge(58.3 %) followed by High (26.6 %) level of Knowledge while about 48.4 % of non - beneficiaries had medium level of knowledge followed by low (33.3%) level of knowledge about different activities of ATMA.

### Keywords

Knowledge,  
ATMA,  
Beneficiaries,  
Non-beneficiaries

## Introduction

The Indian agriculture is at the turning point today. The agricultural growth has powerful leverage effects on the rest of the economy and all the three basic objectives of economic development of the country, viz. poverty alleviation, output growth, and price stability is best contribute by the growth of the agricultural sector (Agnihotri *et al.*, 2018).

Agricultural Technology Management Agency (ATMA) is a registered society responsible for more effective and efficient dissemination of available agricultural technologies at district level. It has linkage

with the extension-related activities of ICAR institutes, including KVKs, research organizations line departments, NGOs and the private sector associated with agricultural development at the district and block levels . The Agricultural Technology Management Agency (ATMA) is the flagship programme for agricultural extension reforms in India. Agricultural technology management agency (ATMA) at district level was pilot tested under innovations in technology dissemination (ITD) component of World Bank funded national agricultural technology project (NATP) with effect from November, 1998 to 2004. It was implemented as a pilot in seven states viz., Andhra Pradesh,

Maharashtra, Bihar, Himachal Pradesh, Jharkhand, Orissa and Punjab covering 4 districts in each state (Sahu *et al.*, 2013).

Organization of training programmes for farmers and other stakeholders is one of the most important activities of ATMA. Training is vital and necessary to induce motivation, create confidence and increase the efficiency of a farmer. It is a process by which desire, ideas, positive attitude, knowledge and skills are inculcated and reinforced. It is an important part of any developmental activity. The present study was conducted to assess the level of knowledge of beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries towards the different activities in east Champaran district of Bihar.

### **Materials and Methods**

This study was carried out in East Champaran district of Bihar state. East Champaran district has been divided into twenty one (27) blocks. Out of the twenty seven blocks of East Champaran district, Motihari block were selected randomly and from each block six villages were randomly selected for the study. From each village, two types of farmers that is Beneficiaries and Non beneficiaries were selected in equal number from each selected village. The size of sample was 120. 60 belongs to beneficiaries category and rest 60 belongs to Non beneficiaries category. The obtained results were analyzed in the form of frequency, percentage, mean and standard deviation.

### **Results and Discussion**

The finding revealed socio-economic status of the respondents in Table 2 indicated that majority of the ATMA beneficiaries 71.5 per cent had medium level of socio-economic status, followed by 16.3 per cent of the beneficiaries had high level of socio-economic status and only 11.2 per cent were

having low level of socio – economic condition. Whereas, the maximum 66.6 per cent of the non-beneficiaries had medium level of socio-economic status followed by 20.0 per cent non-beneficiaries had low level of socio-economic status and 13.4 per cent were taking the high level of socio-economic status.

The finding revealed that Knowledge of the respondents about ATMA Table 3. The table indicated that majority of the ATMA beneficiaries 78.3 per cent had medium level of knowledge about ATMA programme, followed by 11.7 per cent of the beneficiaries had high level of knowledge about ATMA programme and only 10.0 per cent were having low level of knowledge about ATMA programme. Whereas, the maximum 51.6 per cent of the non-beneficiaries had medium level of knowledge about ATMA programme followed by 48.4 per cent non-beneficiaries had low level of knowledge about ATMA programme.

Regarding Training in Table 2 indicated that majority of the ATMA beneficiaries 56.6 per cent had medium level of knowledge about training programme, followed by 36.6 per cent of the beneficiaries had high level of knowledge about training programme and only 6.8 per cent were having low level of knowledge about training programme. Whereas, the maximum 48.4 per cent of the non-beneficiaries had medium level of knowledge about training programme followed by 30.0 per cent non-beneficiaries had low level of knowledge about training programme and about 21.6 per cent of non-beneficiaries had high level of knowledge about training.

Regarding Knowledge of the respondents about Demonstration in table 3 indicated that majority of the ATMA beneficiaries 48.3 per cent had medium level of knowledge about

demonstration programme, followed by 28.3 per cent of the beneficiaries had high level of knowledge about demonstration programme and about 23.4 per cent were having low level of knowledge about demonstration programme. Whereas, the maximum 43.3 per cent of the non-beneficiaries had medium level of knowledge about demonstration programme followed by 38.4 per cent non-beneficiaries had low level of knowledge about demonstration programme and about 18.3 per cent of non-beneficiaries had high level of knowledge about demonstration.

Regarding Knowledge of the respondents

about Exposure visit in table 3 indicated that majority of the ATMA beneficiaries 60.0 per cent had medium level of knowledge about exposure visit, followed by 21.7 per cent of the beneficiaries had high level of knowledge about exposure visit and about 18.3 per cent were having low level of knowledge about exposure visit. Whereas, the maximum 48.4 per cent of the non-beneficiaries had medium level of knowledge about exposure visit followed by 36.6 per cent non-beneficiaries had low level of knowledge about exposure visit and about 15.0 per cent of non-beneficiaries had high level of knowledge about exposure visit.

**Table.1** Distribution of the respondents according to their socio- economy characteristics

| S.No. | Variables            | Categories  | Beneficiaries<br>f(f%) | Non-<br>beneficiaries<br>f(f%) |
|-------|----------------------|---|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1.    | Education            | Illiterate  | 7(11.7%)               | 8(13.3%)                       |
|       |                      | Primary(up to 5 <sup>th</sup> class)              | 11(18.3%)              | 23(38.4%)                      |
|       |                      | Secondary(5 <sup>th</sup> to 10 <sup>th</sup> )   | 12(20%)                | 7(11.7%)                       |
|       |                      | High School(11 <sup>th</sup> & 12 <sup>th</sup> ) | 26(43.3%)              | 17(28.3%)                      |
|       |                      | Graduation  | 4(6.7%)                | 5(8.3%)                        |
| 2.    | Occupation           | Agriculture                                       | 60(100%)               | 58(96.6%)                      |
|       |                      | Animal Husbandry                                  | 16(26.6%)              | 19(31.6%)                      |
|       |                      | Poultry   | 0(0%)                  | 2(3.3%)                        |
|       |                      | Labour  | 9(15%)                 | 15(25%)                        |
|       |                      | Horticulture                                      | 32(53.3%)              | 8(13.3%)                       |
|       |                      | Business  | 12(20%)                | 7(11.7%)                       |
| 3.    | Family Type          | Nuclear Family                                    | 46(76.6%)              | 41(68.3%)                      |
|       |                      | Joint Family                                      | 14(23.4%)              | 19(31.7%)                      |
| 4.    | Land Holding         | Marginal(Less than 1 hec.)                        | 28(46.6%)              | 31(51.7%)                      |
|       |                      | Small(1-2 hec)                                    | 18(30%)                | 15(25%)                        |
|       |                      | Semi medium(2-4 hec)                              | 8(13.4%)               | 9(15%)                         |
|       |                      | Medium(4-10 hec)                                  | 6(10%)                 | 5(8.3%)                        |
| 5.    | Social Participation | Member in no organization                         | 0(0%)                  | 40(66.6%)                      |
|       |                      | Member in one organization                        | 38(63.4%)              | 13(21.6%)                      |
|       |                      | Membership in two or more than two organization   | 22(36.6%)              | 7(11.8%)                       |

**Table.2** Distribution of the respondents according to their socio- economy status

| S. No. | Categories         | Beneficiaries<br>(n=60) | Non-beneficiaries<br>(n=60) | Total<br>(n=120) |
|--------|--------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------|
| 1.     | Low (up to 13)     | 7(11.2%)                | 12(20.0%)                   | 19(15.8%)        |
| 2.     | Medium (14 to 30 ) | 43(71.5%)               | 40(66.6%)                   | 83(69.2%)        |
| 3.     | High ( above 30 )  | 10(16.3%)               | 8(13.4%)                    | 18(15.0%)        |
|        | <b>Total</b>       | <b>60</b>               | <b>60</b>                   | <b>120</b>       |

Mean = 21.7 S.D. = 8.1

**Table.3** Distribution of respondents according to their level Knowledge about ATMA

| S.no. | Different activities of ATMA | Level of Knowledge of Beneficiaries |                  |                | Level of Knowledge of Non-beneficiaries |                  |               |
|-------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|----------------|---|------------------|---------------|
|       |                              | Low<br>f (f%)                       | Medium<br>f (f%) | High<br>f (f%) | Low<br>f (f%)                           | Medium<br>F (f%) | Low<br>f (f%) |
| 1     | About Programme              | 6(10.0%)                            | 47(78.3%)        | 7(11.7%)       | 29(48.4%)                               | 31(51.6%)        | 0(0%)         |
| 2     | About Training               | 4(6.8%)                             | 34(56.6%)        | 22(36.6%)      | 18(30.0%)                               | 29(48.4%)        | 13(21.6%)     |
| 3     | About Demonstration          | 14(23.4%)                           | 29(48.3%)        | 17(28.3%)      | 23(38.4%)                               | 26(43.3%)        | 11(18.3%)     |
| 4     | About Exposure Visit         | 11(18.3%)                           | 36(60.0%)        | 13(21.7%)      | 22(36.6%)                               | 29(48.4%)        | 9(15.0%)      |
| 5     | Overall knowledge            | 9(15.0%)                            | 35(58.3%)        | 16(26.6%)      | 20(33.3%)                               | 29(48.4%)        | 11(18.3%)     |

**Table.4** Relationship between socio-economic characteristics and knowledge of beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries

| S.No. | Characteristics      | “r” value(beneficiaries) | “r” value(Non-beneficiaries) |
|-------|----------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| 1     | Education            | 0.2456**                 | 0.2316**                     |
| 2     | Occupation           | 0.1872*                  | 0.1784*                      |
| 3     | Family type          | 0.3681**                 | 0.1811*                      |
| 4     | Land Holding         | 0.1164NS                 | 0.0173NS                     |
| 5     | Social Participation | 0.4678**                 | 0.1108NS                     |

Regarding overall Knowledge of the respondents in table indicated that majority of the ATMA beneficiaries 58.3 per cent had medium level of overall knowledge, followed by 26.6 per cent of the beneficiaries had high level of overall knowledge and about 15.0 per cent were having low level of overall knowledge. Whereas, the maximum 48.4 per cent of the non-beneficiaries had medium level of

overall knowledge followed by 33.3 per cent non-beneficiaries had low level of overall knowledge and about 18.3 per cent of non-beneficiaries had high overall level of knowledge. Similar finding is also reported by Sahu (2011).

It is clearly seen from the table that for beneficiaries Education, Family type and Social participation are significant with

knowledge at 0.01 level of probability while occupation is significant at 0.05 level probability. In case of non-beneficiaries education is significant at 0.01 level of probability while occupation and family type at 0.05 level of probability. Land holding is non-significantly associated with both beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries while social participation is non-significant for non-beneficiaries. Similar finding is also reported by Arya *et al.*, (2012) and Agnihotri *et al.*, (2018).

### Conclusion

Based on the results presented above, it could be concluded that majority of ATMA beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries had medium level of socio-economic status. Regarding knowledge, majority of the ATMA beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries had medium level of overall knowledge. Education, Family type and Social participation are significant with knowledge at 0.01 level of probability while occupation is significant at 0.05 level probability. In case of non-beneficiaries education is significant at 0.01 level of probability while occupation and family type at 0.05 level of probability. Land holding is non-significantly associated with both beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries while social participation is non-significant for non-beneficiaries.

### References

- ATMA Guidelines. Under NMAET. Guidelines for the centrally sponsored scheme national mission on agricultural extension and technology (NMAET) to be implemented during XII plan. Department of Agriculture and cooperation, Govt. of India, 2014.
- Agnihotri, N., Bose D.K and Jahanara (2018) Impact of ATMA on Knowledge and Attitude towards sugarcane production technology in Sitapur district of Uttar Pradesh. *International Journal Of Research Culture Society ISSN: 2456-6683 Volume – 2*
- Arya, S., Singh, D. K. and Singh, S. (2012). Extent of Knowledge of Change Agents and Correlation Analysis of Variables with Their Communication Skill. *Indian Res.J .Ext. Edu.*, 12(2): 21-24.
- Borban,Santosh (2007). A study on training needs as perceived by the farmers of KrishiVigyan Kendra Betul district of Madhya Pradesh. M.Sc. (Agri) Thesis submitted to Jawaharlal Nehru KrishiVishwaVidyalaya, Jabalpur.
- Chouhan, S., Singh, S.R.K., Pande, A.K., Gautam, U.S. and Mishra, S. (2012)Assessing differential knowledge level apropos improved sugarcane cultivation practices in Madhya Pradesh. *Indian Journal of Extension Education*. 48 (1& 2 ): 95-97, 2012.
- Dutt K. Sunil, Rajeshwarjakkawad, Rajendra, C. Sawant and S.B. Pawar (2016). Extent of Participation and Knowledge Level of the Beneficiaries About Various Aspects of ATMA Model and Benefits Availed. *Journal of Trends in Biosciences 10(24), Print: ISSN 0974-8431, 5051-5055, 2017.*
- Gonshetwad, B. M., Mokhale, S. U., KapilJat, Deshmukh A. N.(2015) Attitude of beneficiaries towards Agriculture Technology Management Agency (ATMA). *Journal of Agriculture Update 2016 Vol.11 No.3 pp.298-300 ref.6.*
- Nadre, K.R; Karegaonkar, Smita Dynanobarao (2003) A study on

- Attitude of farmer's towards agricultural technology management agency in Aurangabad District, Maharashtra.
- Naik, HussainMunir, Srivastava, S.R., Godara, A.K. and Yadav, V.P.S. (2009). Knowledge level about organic farming in Haryana. *Indian Res. J. Ext. Edu.*, 9 (1): 50-53.
- Prakash, Satya and De, Dipak (2005). A study of agricultural technology dissemination by ATMA among farmers of Madhubani district, Behar, U.P., Ph.D. (Ag.) Thesis, department of extension education. B.H.U, Varanasi, 2005.
- Raghavendra, K.M. (2010). An impact study on farmer's knowledge and adoption level of sunflower frontline demonstrations (FLDs) in Bijapur district of Karnataka. M.Sc (Agri.) Thesis, Univ. Agric. Sci., Dharwad, Karnataka (India).
- Sahu Bhedu Prasad, Chaturvedi, M.K. and Yadav Kedar Nath. (2011). Impact of agricultural technology management agency (ATMA) on socio-economic status of tribal farmers. *Agric. Update*, 8(1&2): 1-7 (2013).
- Surve, R.N. (2002). A study on attitude of the farmers towards National Agricultural Insurance scheme of M.Sc. (Agri.) Thesis M.A.U., Parbhani.