

*Original Research Article*

**Socioeconomic Profile of the Rural Youth Trainees on Mushroom Production in the Western part of Uttar Pradesh**

**Comment [Z1]:** The title is good (17 words)

**ABSTRACT**

The present research study was conducted during 2022-23 to know the Socioeconomic status of the rural youth trainees on mushroom production in the Western part of Uttar Pradesh. Three K.V.K.s were chosen for the study. From each K.V.K., 60 respondents were chosen, constituting a sample of 180 respondents. The structured interview schedule was used to collect data through the personal interview method. The study reported that the majority (57.78%) of the respondents belonged to the middle-aged group of 25 to 30 years, male (83.90%) belonging to another backward caste (53.33%), educated upto middle school (29.40%), married (77.80%) with marginal land holding (49.40%) and 76.10% had social participation. The majority (52.78%) of the respondents were involved in mushroom production, had medium (43.30%) annual income of 1 to 4 lakhs, medium (51.11%) information source utilization, low experience (66.67%) of upto 5 years, medium (54.44%) achievement motivation and medium (54.44%) economic motivation. The majority (70.56%) of the respondents received on-campus training, and a maximum (66.67%) respondents participated in three days of training programs.

**Comment [Z2]:** Abstract is good (172 Words). maximum abstract of 250 words, and it is suggested to add the implications of the research results.

**Keywords:** Krishi Vignan Kendra, Mushroom Production, Rural Youths, Training, Socioeconomic profile, Achievement motivation, Economic Motivation

**Comment [Z3]:** Keywords are good (7 Words). Maximum keywords are five words, it is recommended to reduce them by selecting the most important keywords.

**INTRODUCTION:**

The K.V.K.s are composite training institutions. They deal with all agricultural subjects, including home science. The experiences support that with the limited subject matter specialists /scientists provided in the K.V.K.s, the massive demand for training the farmers and farm women is not being met. For quality and quantity, it has been emphasized to link each discipline of the K.V.K. to its respective discipline of the department of the host institution, either S.A.U.s or the I.C.A.R. research institutes. To bridge the gap between modern agricultural techniques and rural practices, K.V.K.s are dedicated to the transfer of technology (T.O.T.) knowledge through methodologies such as on-farm testing (OFT), front-line demonstration (F.L.D.) and comprehensive training programs aimed at enhancing the skills of rural youth. Nazir *et al.* (2013) emphasized the importance of K.V.K.s in providing both short- and long-term vocational training courses tailored to the community's specific needs, fostering skill-oriented development. Venkatasubramanian *et al.* (2009) listed various trainings such as training for rural youth (both on and off campus), vocational training programs (both on and off campus), sponsored training programs (both on and off campus) at K.V.K.s which are aimed at improving skills of farmers, rural youth, and extension personnel. He also categorized training as short-duration pieces of training (1-7 days), medium-duration training (8-14 days), and long-duration training (3-4 weeks).

Modern agricultural technologies and relevant skills drive agricultural advancements and empower youth to become successful entrepreneurs. The acquisition of knowledge and the mastery of contemporary agricultural practices have a profound impact on rural development. This research examines the profile of the K.V.K. trainees and their training duration. This study sheds light on the profound impact of K.V.K.s on rural youth by investigating the status of knowledge retention and skill application following vocational

training. By understanding the intricacies of this relationship, we can discern the pivotal role of K.V.K.s in shaping the agricultural landscape and driving the transformation of rural communities. Based on the above views, an attempt was made to understand the functioning and assess the profile of K.V.K. trainees in the Western part of Uttar Pradesh with the following specific objective:

**Comment [Z4]:** Introduction is good

- 1) To assess the socioeconomic profile of the trainees
- 2) Types of training imparted by K.V.K. staff to the trainees

## **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

The present study was conducted in 2022 in the western region of Uttar Pradesh, which was selected purposively because the researcher is studying at SVPUA&T Meerut, Uttar Pradesh. Out of 20 K.V.K.s under the jurisdiction of the university, three K.V.K.s were selected purposely namely, Swami Kalyan Dev K.V.K., Hastinapur, Meerut, Krishi Vigyan Kendra Muradnagar, Ghaziabad and Krishi Vigyan Kendra, Khajuri Bagh, Saharanpur. These K.V.K.s are working best in providing training in the area of Mushroom Production. From each K.V.K., 60 respondents were chosen randomly from the list of rural youth trainees provided by the K.V.K. personnel who had taken on-campus rural youth training programs during 2017-2021. Thus, a total of 180 respondents were selected for the study. The socioeconomic profile of trainees was studied using the variables, namely, age, gender, caste category, education status, marital status, social participation, land holding, occupation, milch animal possessions, annual family income, information source utilization, mushroom cultivation experiences, achievement motivation, and economic motivation. The statistical tools used for the study were frequency, percentage, mean, and standard deviation.

**Comment [Z5]:** Materials and methods are good

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### 1. Socioeconomic profile of the trainees

#### Age:

The data table 1 indicates that the majority (57.78%) of the respondents belonged to the middle age group of 25 to 30 years followed by the age group of above 30 years (24.44%). Only 17.78% of the respondents were in the young age group up to 24 years. In general, middle-aged people are more capable and passionate than younger and older age groups. Middle-aged people are also more responsible than younger people. Compared to older people, they appear to be more interested in development and want more money from side jobs. This could cause the bulk of respondents to be in the medium age group. The results were in line with the findings of Biswas *et al.* (2008) and Sunil and Manjula (2010).

#### Gender:

Analyzing the data presented in Table 1, it is evident that a majority (83.90%) of the respondents identified as male, while a smaller proportion (16.10%) identified as female. The participation of women was low due to the long duration of campus training programs, as it is difficult for them to spare time to attend and stay on campus, and mostly, they attended home science programs. The results were in line with the findings of Radhakrishnan (2013).

#### Caste:

Table 1 shows that the majority (53.33%) of the respondents identified with the other backward caste category, followed by the General caste (32.22%), the Schedule caste (08.89%), and Schedule tribes (05.56%). The probable reason for the result was to improve their socioeconomic status. They took training from the K.V.K.S. These findings align with the research of Kailash *et al.* (2017).

**Educational Status:**

Analyzing the data presented in Table 1, it becomes evident that most respondents (93.10%) were literate, whereas only a small percentage (06.90%) identified as illiterate. The range of education among literate respondents varied from primary to postgraduate levels. Among literate respondents, the highest percentage (29.40%) had completed education up to middle school, followed by high school (27.80%), intermediate (13.30%), graduate (06.70%), literate (06.70%), and postgraduate (05.60%).

These results correspond with the findings of Biswas *et al.* (2008).

**Marital Status:**

The data presented in Table 1 represents that most respondents (77.80%) were married, followed by unmarried (22.20 %). Such a high marital status was because of their family commitments and to improve and bring their family through sustainable livelihood activities. Rural communities frequently see a lot of early marriages. These are the primary causes of the high level of married status in the study area. The results were in line with Seema Prakalpa and Jadoun (2014).

**Land Holding:**

The results presented in Table 1. indicate that the majority (49.40%) of respondents fell under the category of marginal farmers, followed by small farmers (36.70%), medium farmers (11.10%), and large farmers (02.80%). The probable reason for having small holdings was fragmentation of the land between the family members. Similar results have been reported by Prashad *et al.* (2017) and Medhi *et al.* (2020).

**Social Participation:**

An analysis of Table 1 shows that the majority (76.10%) of the respondents were

affiliated with one or more organizations, whereas the remaining (23.90%) were not members of any organization. These findings demonstrate the general interest in social organizations among respondents. It can be because of Krishi Vigyan Kendra's initiatives or awareness. Most rural youths may have participated in social activities because of their willingness to volunteer their time, knowledge of K.V.K. training programs for income-generating enterprises, and family support for social mobility and self-confidence. The results were in line with Sharma *et al.* (2020).

**Table 1. Distribution of respondents according to their age, gender, caste, educational status, marital status, land holding, and social participation.**

Sr. No.	Category	Frequency	Percentage
<b>Age</b>			
1.	Young (upto24 years)	32	17.78
2.	Middle ( between25to30 years)	104	57.78
3.	Old(above30 years)	44	24.44
<b>Gender</b>			
1.	Male	151	83.90
2.	Female	29	16.10
<b>Caste</b>			
1.	General	58	32.22
2.	Other Backward Caste (O.B.C.)	96	53.33
3.	Schedule Caste (SC)	16	08.89
4.	Schedule Tribe (S.T.)	10	05.56
<b>Educational Status</b>			
1.	Illiterate	11	06.10

2.	Literate	15	08.30
3.	Primary School (up to 3 classes)	5	02.80
4.	Middle School( 4 to 7 class)	53	29.40
5.	High School( 8 to 10 class)	50	27.80
6.	Intermediate (10+2)	24	13.30
7.	Graduate	12	06.70
8.	Post Graduate	10	05.60
<b>Marital Status</b>			
1.	Married	140	77.80
2.	Unmarried	40	22.20
<b>Land Holding</b>			
1.	Marginal (< 1 ha )	89	49.40
2.	Small (1-2 ha.)	66	36.70
3.	Medium (2-4 ha.)	20	11.10
4.	Large (>4 ha.)	05	02.80
<b>Social Participation</b>			
1.	Member	137	76.10
2.	Non-Member	43	23.90

#### Occupation:

As depicted in Table 2, most respondents (52.80%) were engaged in mushroom production, the most prevalent occupation. This was followed by farming (26.67%), wage-earning (11.10%), a combination of farming and mushroom production (08.89%), and lastly, service-oriented roles (00.56%), respectively. The probable reason was that most respondents took

trainings related to mushrooms and took it as their career.

**Annual Family Income:**

The results from Table 2 show that the majority (43.30%) of the respondents reported a medium family income of 1 to 4 lakhs, followed by a significant share (35.60%) indicating a low family income. In comparison, a comparatively smaller portion (21.10%) reported a high family income, respectively.

**Information source utilization:**

The data from Table 2 reveals that a significant portion of the respondents (51.11%) exhibited a medium level of information source utilization, followed by low (20.56%) and high (28.33%) levels of information source utilization. The probable reason was the respondents were in regular contact with the information sources to get the latest information related to various activities. The findings align with the observations of Rosaiah (2002).

**Mushroom Cultivation Experience:**

Table 2 shows that the majority (66.67%) of the respondents reported having low mushroom cultivation experience of up to five years, followed by a notable proportion with medium (24.44%) cultivation experience spanning above 5 to 10 years, while a smaller percentage (08.89%) possessed high experience exceeding 10 years. The probable reason for the result was that most of them joined the training of K.V.K.s recently and took trainings related to mushroom cultivation, leading to a low experience.

**Achievement Motivation:**

Table 2 reports that a majority (54.44%) of the respondents exhibited a medium level of achievement motivation, followed by (27.23%) with a high level of achievement motivation,

while a smaller segment (18.33%) indicated a low level of achievement motivation. The probable reason was the respondents were highly motivated towards achieving higher positions. These results parallel the findings of Kumar (2001) and Bortamuly (2015).

**Economic Motivation:**

Table 2 indicates that the majority (52.78%) of the respondents exhibited a high level of economic motivation, whereas (32.78%) displayed a medium level of economic motivation, and a smaller portion, 04.44%, indicated a low level of economic motivation. The reason for having high economic motivation was the respondents were oriented towards gaining more profits and improving their economic status.

**Table 2. Distribution of respondents according to their occupation, milch animal possessions, annual family income, source of information, mushroom cultivation experience, achievement motivation, and economic motivation (N=180)**

Sr. No.	Category	Frequency	Percentage
<b>Occupation</b>			
1.	Wage earners	20	11.10
2.	Services	01	00.56
3.	Mushroom production	95	52.78
4.	Farming	48	26.67
5.	Farming+ mushroom production	16	08.89
<b>Annual Family Income</b>			
1.	Low (upto1 lakh)	64	35.60
2.	Medium (1 to 4 lakhs)	78	43.30
3.	High (above 4 Lakhs)	38	21.10
<b>Information source utilization</b>			

1.	Low (up to 42)	37	20.56
2.	Medium (42-58)	92	51.11
3.	High (above 58)	51	28.33
<b>Mean = 49.58</b>		<b>SD = 8.11</b>	
<b>Mushroom Cultivation Experience</b>			
1.	Low (up to 5 years)	120	66.67
2.	Medium (5 to10 years)	44	24.44
3.	High (above 10 years)	16	08.89
<b>Achievement Motivation</b>			
1.	Low (up to 13)	33	18.33
2.	Medium (13to 18)	98	54.44
3.	High ( above18)	49	27.23
<b>Mean = 15.74</b>		<b>SD = 2.25</b>	
<b>Economic Motivation</b>			
1.	Low ( up to 17)	26	14.44
2.	Medium (17 to 24)	95	52.78
3.	High (above 24)	59	32.78
<b>Mean = 20.95</b>		<b>SD = 3.37</b>	

## 2.Types of training imparted by K.V.K. staff to the trainees

### Place of training program:

Table 3 shows that most (70.56%) of the trainees received on-campus training from the K.V.K. because all training facilities and trainers are available at the training center,

followed by off-campus (29.44 %) respectively. The probable reason for having high results for campus training is that it will be easy for the trainees to attend the training from their homes, reducing the troubles of traveling. They can do other activities at home and farm rather than visiting out of town to attend training. Similar results were reported by Dubey *et al.* (2008) and Deshmukh and Singh (2022)

**Table 3. Distribution of the respondents according to their place of training received**

(N= 180)

Sr. No.	Type of Training	Frequency	Percentage
1.	On campus	127	70.56
2.	Off-campus	53	29.44

**Duration of training program:**

Table 4 shows that the majority of respondents (66.67%) took a three-day training program followed by one week (19.44%) and one day (13.89%), respectively. The probable reason for the results was for any training program to be purposeful and effective and to gain in-depth knowledge. They want a minimum three-duration training program, which was found to be sufficient. Similar results were reported by Deshmukh and Singh (2022)

**Comment [Z6]:** Result is good, but it is recommended for discussion plus 1-2 references for each sub-discussion

**Table 4. Distribution of respondents according to the duration of training received**

(N= 180)

Sr. No.	Duration of Training	Frequency	Percentage
---------	----------------------	-----------	------------

1.	One day	25	13.89
2.	Three days	120	66.67
3.	One week	35	19.44

## CONCLUSION

The majority of trainees were in the age category of 25 to 35 years, and the majority of the trainees who participated in the training program observed under the study were male, belonging to other backward classes, and were married. Maximum trainees were educated upto middle school, engaged in mushroom production and farming, possessed marginal land and had membership in organizations with medium family income. The study underscored the pivotal role of information sources in influencing decision-making, with a considerable proportion of respondents exhibiting medium utilization levels. Additionally, their mushroom cultivation experience primarily fell within the range of up to five years, and achievement motivation was commonly reported at medium levels, indicating a balanced pursuit of excellence. Economic motivation was medium, with many respondents exhibiting a high desire for financial success. Most of the trainees preferred the on-campus training program. Maximum trainees found three days of training method helped in improving their knowledge. A look into the study of the training program, it is heartening to note that the trainees had shown an overall satisfaction and high regard for the K.V.K. training, the subject matter specialists, the facilities, etc.

**Comment [Z7]:** Conclusion is good

## REFERENCES

**Comment [Z8]:** References are good, but it is recommended for discussion plus 1-2 references for each sub-discussion

1. **Balu, S. (2000).** Appraisal of Janmabhoomi program by rural people in Mahaboobnagar district of Andhra Pradesh. *M.Sc. (Ag) Thesis*, Acharya N.G. Ranga Agricultural University, Hyderabad.
2. **Biswas, S., A. Sarkar and A. Goswami, (2008).** Impact of K.V.K. training on Advance Dairy Farming Practices in changing knowledge and attitude of Pranibandhu. *Journal of Dairying Foods Home Science*, 27: 43-46.
3. **Bortamuly, D. (2015).** A Study on the Role Performance of the Agricultural Extension Personnel in the Revitalized Extension System in the State of Assam. Ph.D. Thesis. Department of Extension Education, Faculty of Agriculture, Assam Agricultural University, Jorhat, Assam.
4. **Chandrapaul, K. (1998).** A study on entrepreneurial behavior of vegetable growers in Krishna district of Andhra Pradesh. *M.Sc. (Ag) Thesis*, Acharya N.G. Ranga Agricultural University, Hyderabad.
5. **Deshmukh, S. and Singh, M. (2022).** Assessing Training Need Through Participatory Rural Appraisal and Situational with TWOS Matrix, *The Pharma Innovation*, 11(11): 40-47.
6. **Dubey, A. K., Srivastva, J.P., Singh, R.P. and Sharma, V.K. (2008).** Impact of K.V.K. Training Programme on Socio-economic Status and Knowledge of Trainees in Allahabad District, *Indian Res. J. Ext. Edu.* 8 (2&3): 61-61.
7. **Kailash, Mishra, O.P., Singh, S.K. and Verma, H. K. (2017).** A study on socioeconomic impact of use the mobile phone technology among the farmers of Rajasthan state. *Agric. Update*, 12(3):454-458.
8. **Kumar, K. (2001).** Entrepreneurial behaviour of floriculture farmers in Ranga Reddy district of Andhra Pradesh *M.Sc (Ag) Thesis*, Acharya N.G. Ranga Agricultural University, Hyderabad.

9. **Medhi, S., Singha, A.K., Singh, R. and Singh, R. J. (2020)** Socioeconomic, Psychological Profile and Constraints faced by the K.V.K. Adopted Farmers for Improved Rice Cultivation in West Garo Hills District, *Economic Affairs*,65(3): 379-388.
10. **Nazir, T., Vaida, N and Dar, M. A. (2013).** Role of Krishi Vigyan Kendras for empowerment of rural women through vocational trainings. *Basic Research Journal of Agricultural Science and Review*, 2(3): 51-56.
11. **Prashad, N., Verma, S.K., Singh, K.M., Singh, L.B. and Sahu, R.P. (2017).** To Study the Association Between Socioeconomic and Communication Characteristics on Knowledge, Attitude and Adoption of the Respondents,*Interaction*, 30 (1): 127-131.
12. **Radhakrishnan, P. (2013).** A Study on Shifting Pattern of Rural Youth and the means for Retention in Agriculture. Unpublished. M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis, AC&RI, TNAU, Coimbatore.
13. **Rosaiah Yeluri, (2002).** An Analysis of Knowledge Gap on I.P.M. Technologies of Cotton A Systems Approach. Unpublished. M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis, AC&RI, TNAU, Coimbatore.
14. **Seemaprakalpa and Jadoun, P. (2014).**Socioeconomic status and knowledge and their impact on trainees of K.V.K., *International Journal of Communication & Business Manage*, 7(2): 329-333.
15. **Sharma P.S., Prajapati V.S. and Jadav N.B (2020).** Socioeconomic profile of rural farm women in K.V.K. operational villages of Rajkot district. *Journal of the Social Sciences*,48(3): 4264-4270.
16. **Sunil,N.K.and Manjula,N.(2010).**Socioeconomic,psychological and extension attributes of trained and untrained farmers of K.V.K., Bijapur, *Agriculture Update*,5(1&2): 38-42
17. **Venkatasubramanian, V., Sajeev, M.V. and Singha, A.K. (2009).** Concepts, Approaches and Methodologies for Technology Application and Transfer: A Resource book for K.V.K.s. Umiam, Meghalaya: Zonal Project Directorate, Zone – III.