

"A Study of the Impact of Key Village Scheme in Gujarat State"

Submitted to Gujarat Agricultural University,
1978

K. G. Halyal

Department of Extension Education, B. A.
College of Agriculture, Anand

There is a wide gap between the availability and requirement of milk in India. Cattle play a vital role in rural economy of our country. Cattle are the foundation of Agriculture in India. In order to increase the country's feed production both plant and animal origin, it is imperative that the quality of our cattle be improved.

All India key village scheme was initiated in Gujarat State at various place since 1952. The progress of some of the key village blocks was quite promising from the beginning, but some of the key village blocks were lingering and showed no satisfactory progress. Consequent to recommendations of evaluation committee report, both departmental and central, many of the poor key village blocks were closed and some weaker ones were watched carefully for the progress. There were 14 key village blocks working at the time of study.

The objectives envisaged for the study were: To evaluate 14 key village blocks in terms of progress achieved from 1967-68 to 1971-72 and to study the impact of key village scheme and also the factors responsible for high or low impact created by the working of key village scheme in the area of operation.

This study was designed to study the impact of the key village scheme and all the activities envisaged in the scheme by studying the annual progress, report of the key village blocks working in Gujarat State. All the fourteen working blocks were selected for the study.

The determination of impact and categorisation of key village blocks was designed as follows: with the help of the evaluation score card, yearly data of the progress of scheme activities were converted into score. After determination of rank order each rank was scored. Top scoring rank order was assigned 14 marks and least scoring rank order, one mark. Based on the total rank order score, the key village blocks were given ranks and arranged in descending order of rank score.

The high impact and low impact blocks were the sample areas for the study. The blocks were divided in three groups on the basis of rank order score and one top ranking and one least scoring blocks were selected for the study. The villages were selected on the basis of random sample from the key village blocks of high and low impact, and one village from each unit. The respondents were selected on the basis of stratified random sampling method. Two schedules and one questionnaire were prepared and used as tools for the study. The data were collected through personal interview. For statistical analysis, chi-square test was applied at appropriate places to test the dependent and independent factors on impact.

The major findings of the study are grouped together under two main groups of key village—Key village blocks of high impact and key village block of low impact.

The rank order score in case of high impact of key village scheme was 170 as against 57 at the key village blocks of low impact. Ranges of rank order score for key village blocks of high and low impact were 145 to 170 and 57 to 96 respectively.

Majority of the farmers at the villages of high impact were from patel community with higher educational level, and were found to participate in the village institutions. They owned smaller holdings having better irrigation facilities with high intensity of cropping. Some of them cultivated green fodders and more cash crops comparatively. Many of them provided education for their children. They were getting higher returns from the land and stayed in pucca built-up houses. They had their own source of water and their residences were well furnished with radio or transistors, and enjoyed comparatively a higher standard of living. Majority of the farmers at the villages of low impact were from the communities other than Patel with low level of education and did not participate in the village institutions. The holdings were comparatively larger but no irrigation facilities. The intensity of cropping was low, few farmers cultivated green fodder and more of cereal crops than cash crops. Majority of them did not attempt for the education of their children. They were getting low returns from the land. Majority of them stayed in Katcha houses or partly pucca houses. They depended for drinking water on public water supply. Facilities like built in latrins, bathrooms were scarcely available. Their residences were poorly furnished and lived at a lower level of living standard.

Majority of the farmers at the villages of high impact adopted A.I. as a method of breeding and checked their animals for sterility and in fertility and rendered their animals for pregnancy diagnosis at the village A.I. centre. Majority of them replaced bullocks by raising bullocks and got their ani-

mals castrated by burdizzo's castrator. They sent their unproductive animals to nearest pinjrapole. They fed their animals with conventional feeds as concentrates and cultivated green fodders, but fed the dry fodder without cutting them into pieces. They felt the importance of vaccination of animals at the time of out break. Few farmers participated in calf-rally, exhibition, milk recording and milk yield competitions. Thus they were taking advantages of the scheme and other allied activities on commencement of the scheme.

Majority of the farmers at the villages of low impact adopted natural service for breeding animals. They disposed of uneconomic animals by sending them to pinjrapole. They fed convential feed to their animals. They were unable to cultivate green fodder due to scarcity of water but fed dry fodder after cutting them into small pieces with the help of chaff cutter or sickle. They got their animals vaccinated and treated whenever necessary. They disposed of their milk through private vendors. Very few participated in such activities like calf rally, exhibition, milk recording, milk yield competitions.

General village conditions at the villages of high impact were: They occupied smaller area with net work of irrigation. The literacy percentage ranged from 31-40 per cent and was high. In general, the farmers were progressive. The prevailing general condition at the villages of low impact was not conducive for quick progress, the literacy percentage was low and villages were larger with no or limited irrigation facilities and farmers in general were some what backward with rigid and traditional attitude towards animal husbandry practices.

It can be concluded that there was high impact wherever, socio-economic conditions were comparatively high and low impact wherever socio-economic condition of farmers were low.