Effectiveness of Knowledge Input Technology Sharing (KITS) Journey Program in Promoting Organic Agriculture in Selected Municipalities of Region VIII

Marejen A. Villaremo[1*] & Antonia Cecilia Y. Sandoval[2]

[1]Instructor, Ecological Farm and Resource Management Institute, Visayas State University, Visca, Baybay Leyte, Email:marejen.villaremo@vsu.edu.ph

[2]Professor, Department of Agricultural Education and Extension, Visayas State University, Baybay Leyte, Email:antoniacecilia.sandoval@vsu.edu.ph

ABSTRACT

The study was undertaken to determine the effectiveness of KITS Journey Program in promoting Organic Agriculture in ten selected municipalities of Region VIII. Frequency counts, percentages and Cramer's V were used to describe the respondents' socio demographic characteristics and their association with the level of effectiveness of KITS. Majority of the respondents (58.7%) belonged to the aged bracket of 42-62 yrs.old. They were mostly females (63.4%), married (76.2%), of Roman Catholic religion and who had been in farming for 22 years and more. For knowledge shared, enhanced knowledge in crop production was primarily gained by the beneficiaries (84.9%), seeds were the dominant inputs acquired (88.4%) and diversified farming was the most prominent technology learned (84.9%). Beneficiaries considered the KITS program as effective (62.8%) because it improved their farm production and increased income. Regarding relationship, knowledge on crop, livestock and vermiculture was significantly related to age, religion, education and years of farming. In material input sharing, inputs in crop, livestock, poultry, fishery, vermiculture and fruit trees were significantly related to gender, religion, education and years of farming. For technology shared, earoponics (9), hydroponics (8), PALAYAMANAN (4), diversified farming (2) and integrated farming system (1) were significantly related to age, marital status, religion and education. Among farmers' socio-demographic characteristics (gender, age, marital status, religion and education) only years of farming was significantly related to the overall effectiveness of KITS in promoting Organic Agriculture.

Table 1. Relationship between demographic characteristics of farmer beneficiaries and the level of effectiveness of KITS in terms of knowledge, input and technology sharing

Demographic Variable n=172	Knowledge Sharing done by OMRO					
	Crop	Livestock	Poultry	Fishery	Vermiculture	Fruit trees
Gender	0.0358	0.1063	0.0288	0.0138	0.0354	0.0233
	(0.6390)	(0.1630)	(0.7060)	(0.8560)	(0.6430)	(0.7600)
Age	0.1141	0.0475	0.0770	0.0331	0.2140*	0.0902
	(0.3260)	(0.8240)	(0.6000)	(0.9100)	(0.0200)	(0.4960)
Marital Status	0.1133	0.1326	0.0466	0.1542	0.0031	0.0414
	(0.3320)	(0.0820)	(0.8300)	(0.1300)	(0.9670)	(0.8630)

Religion	0.2205* (0.0040)	0.2294* (0.0030)	0.0770 (0.3130)	0.0170 (0.8240)	0.1203 (0.1150)	0.1418 (0.0630)
Education	0.2679* (0.0020)	0.1794 (0.0650)	0.1718 (0.0810)	0.0931 (0.4780)	0.1309 (0.2330)	0.0673 (0.6800)
Years of farming	0.3241* (0.0010)	0.0268 (0.7250)	0.1534 (0.4000)	0.1361 (0.5270)	0.2491* (0.0300)	0.1518 (0.4110)

Demographic Variable n=172	Input Sharing done by OMRO					
	Crop	Livestock	Poultry	Fishery	Vermiculture	Fruit tree
Gender	0.1091 (0.3590)	0.0037 (0.9620)	0.0137 (0.8570)	0.0014 (0.9850)	0.1957* (0.0100)	0.0087 (0.9100)
Age	0.1240 (0.2670)	0.0110 (0.9900)	0.0053 (0.9980)	0.0767 (0.6030)	0.1386 (0.1920)	0.0246 (0.9490)
Marital Status	0.1115 (0.3430)	0.0070 (0.9270)	0.0434 (0.5690)	0.0280 (0.7130)	0.0863 (0.2580)	0.0130 (0.8650)
Religion	0.2544* (0.0040)	0.2296* (0.0030)	0.1716* (0.0240)	0.0794 (0.2980)	0.1864* (0.0150)	0.2324* (0.0020)
Education	0.3149* (0.0000)	0.2801* (0.0010)	0.2703* (0.0020)	0.1860* (0.0215)	0.2481* (0.0050)	0.2410* (0.0070)
Years of farming	0.3512* (0.0000)	0.3700* (0.0000)	0.3370* (0.0010)	0.1835* (0.0312)	0.2119* (0.0235)	0.3016* (0.0040)

Demographic Variable	Technologies shared								
	Tech.1	Tech. 2	Tech.3	Tech.4	Tech. 5	Tech. 6	Tech. 7	Tech. 8	Tech. 9
Gender	0.0644 (0.3980)	0.0887 (0.2440)	0.0258 (0.7350)	0.0295 (0.6990)	0.0825 (0.2790)	0.1140 (0.1350)	0.1430 (0.1720)	0.0807 (0.5710)	0.0032 (0.9660)
Age	0.0340 (0.9050)	0.0962 (0.4510)	0.1761 (0.0690)	0.1270 (0.2500)	0.0213 (0.9620)	0.0443 (0.8450)	0.0993 (0.4950)	0.1999* (0.0320)	0.1324 (0.2210)
Marital Status	0.1153 (0.1310)	0.0645 (0.3980)	0.0943 (0.2160)	0.0633 (0.4070)	0.1155 (0.1300)	0.0582 (0.4450)	0.1001 (0.4220)	0.2768* (0.0000)	0.1555* (0.0410)
Religion	0.1994* (0.0090)	0.0285 (0.7090)	0.0839 (0.2710)	0.1609* (0.0350)	0.1365 (0.0740)	0.1438 (0.0590)	0.1315 (0.2260)	0.0923 (0.2260)	0.0221 (0.7720)
Education	0.1748 (0.0750)	0.2737* (0.0020)	0.0543 (0.7780)	0.1760 (0.0720)	0.0368 (0.8910)	0.1259 (0.2600)	0.0395 (0.8760)	0.0987 (0.4370)	0.1142 (0.3300)
Years of farming	0.1249 (0.1010)	0.1061 (0.1640)	0.0060 (0.9370)	0.1461 (0.0550)	0.0588 (0.4410)	0.1032 (0.1760)	0.0750 (0.3250)	0.0808 (0.2900)	0.0125 (0.8700)

Figures inside the parentheses are p-values. Figures without parentheses are Cramer's V or phi coefficient.

* P-values smaller than the 0.05 level of significance indicates significant relationship.

Keywords: *knowledge, input, technology, sharing, effectiveness, relationship*