



## Adoption of Organic Farming: Assessing the Impact of Paramparagat Krishi Vikas Yojana (PKVY)

Minal Kumbhare<sup>1</sup>, Sonam Agrawal<sup>2\*</sup>, Chandrika Sharma<sup>3</sup> and Seema Naberia<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>M.Sc. Scholar, Department of Extension Education, JNKVV, Jabalpur (Madhya Pradesh), India.

<sup>2</sup>Assistant Professor, Department of Extension Education, JNKVV, Jabalpur (Madhya Pradesh), India.

<sup>3</sup>Lab Technician, Department of Extension Education, JNKVV, Jabalpur (Madhya Pradesh), India.

(Corresponding author: Sonam Agrawal\*)

(Received: 26 October 2025; Revised: 20 December 2025; Accepted: 15 January 2026; Published online: 04 February 2026)

(Published by Research Trend)

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.65041/BiologicalForum.2026.18.2.3>

**ABSTRACT:** Indian agriculture is increasingly challenged by environmental degradation, excessive dependence on chemical inputs, and unsustainable production practices, which collectively threaten long-term agricultural productivity and ecological balance. In this context, organic farming has emerged as a viable and sustainable alternative due to its potential to improve soil health, conserve biodiversity, and ensure food safety. To promote organic cultivation, the Government of India launched the Paramparagat Krishi Vikas Yojana (PKVY) under the National Mission for Sustainable Agriculture with a cluster-based approach. The present study was conducted to evaluate the impact of PKVY and to identify key factors influencing the adoption of organic farming practices in Narmadapuram district of Madhya Pradesh. An ex post facto research design was adopted, with a sample of 100 farmers, comprising 50 PKVY beneficiaries and 50 non-beneficiaries selected through simple random sampling. Primary data were collected using a structured interview schedule, and statistical analyses were performed using frequency, percentage, mean, standard deviation, Pearson's correlation coefficient, and Z-test to assess variations and relationships among the variables. The findings revealed that family size, landholding, area under organic farming, annual income, innovativeness, market orientation, awareness of PKVY activities, extension contact, training on organic farming, and attitude towards organic farming were positively and significantly correlated with adoption at the 5 per cent level of significance. Furthermore, experience in organic farming and environmental orientation showed a positive and highly significant relationship with adoption at the 1 per cent level. These results emphasize the critical role of socio-psychological and communicational factors in shaping sustainable farming behaviour. In conclusion, while PKVY has had a considerable impact on enhancing the adoption of organic farming among beneficiary farmers, addressing operational constraints through strengthened policies, infrastructure development, and farmer-oriented support systems is essential for scaling up organic farming in India.

**Keywords:** Organic farming, Sustainable agriculture, PKVY beneficiary, Attitude of organic farming, Adoption of organic farming.

### INTRODUCTION

Indian agriculture is presently challenged by rapid population growth, depletion of land and water resources, environmental degradation, biodiversity loss, climate change, rising production costs and declining soil fertility. These problems have been intensified by the prolonged use of chemical-based inputs introduced during the Green Revolution. Although these practices substantially increased crop yields, their excessive application has caused long-term ecological disturbances and health risks. The accumulation of chemical residues in the food chain through plant and animal products has further led to bio-magnification (Sharma *et al.*, 2024). In order to achieve sustainable

Kumbhare *et al.*,

*Biological Forum*

production, enough to feed the current population along with contributing the rural development through providing livelihood to farmers and without endangering the ecosystem simultaneously preserving for future ones, we need more and sustained changes in our food production system (Sharma *et al.*, 2022). The use of organic amendments has emerged as a sustainable alternative for improving soil fertility and crop protection without adversely affecting the ecosystem. Organic farming is a unique production management system that promotes and enhances the health of the agro ecosystem, including biodiversity, biological cycles, and soil biological activity. The beneficial effects of vermin-compost and its humic

18(2): 18-24(2026)

18

components, particularly humic acid, in enhancing agricultural productivity and environmental sustainability have been well documented (Sansei *et al.*, 2007).

Sustainable agriculture seeks to integrate environmental integrity, economic viability, and social equity. Several alternative approaches such as integrated pest management, integrated crop management, low-input agriculture, permaculture, biodynamic farming, natural farming, precision agriculture, and organic farming have been promoted. Among these, organic farming is widely accepted as a holistic system that emphasizes nutrient recycling, resource conservation, ecosystem restoration, and reduced ecological footprints while supporting food security (Tiwari, 2023).

Organic farming aims to produce quality crops while conserving natural resources (Sharma *et al.*, 2022). To promote this system, the Government of India launched schemes such as Paramparagat Krishi Vikas Yojana (PKVY) and Mission Organic Value Chain Development for the North East Region (MOVCDNER) in 2015–16, providing financial, technical, certification, and marketing support. Under PKVY, farmers receive Rs. 15,000 per hectare over three years for adopting organic inputs (Anonymous, 2024). Madhya Pradesh leads the country with 74,960 ha under PKVY and 1,16,360 organic farmers, supported by Rs. 14.163 lakh government funding (APEDA, 2023–24). Based on this background, the present study was undertaken with the following objectives:

#### **OBJECTIVES**

1. To study the impact in terms of adoption of organic farming on beneficiary and non beneficiary farmers.
2. To analyze the relationship between the profile of PKVY beneficiary farmers and adoption of organic farming.

#### **METHODOLOGY**

The present investigation was conducted in Narmadapuram block of Narmadapuram district, Madhya Pradesh, which had the highest number of PKVY clusters (26) in the state during the year 2024–25. Pahanbarri village comprises two PKVY clusters, each consisting of 50 registered beneficiary farmers. Out of these, one cluster comprising 50 beneficiaries was selected randomly for the study. For comparative purposes, 50 non-beneficiary farmers were also selected through random sampling from a nearby village. Consequently, the total sample size of the study was 100 respondents.

To examine the variation in the level of adoption, ex post facto and exploratory research designs were

adopted. Primary data were collected using a pre-tested and structured interview schedule that included socio-personal, psychological, and communication-related variables, as well as items assessing knowledge related to the PKVY scheme. The data were subjected to statistical analysis using frequency and percentage distributions, Z-test for testing mean differences, and correlation and regression analyses to determine the relationships between independent variables and the knowledge level of respondents.

#### **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

Table 1 indicates a marked disparity in the adoption of organic farming practices between beneficiary and non-beneficiary farmers. With respect to field preparation, complete adoption of farmyard manure (FYM) was observed among all beneficiary farmers (100%), whereas only 32 per cent of non-beneficiaries reported full adoption. Vermicompost was fully adopted by 62 per cent of beneficiaries, in contrast to only 10 per cent among non-beneficiaries. Similar patterns were observed for the use of jeevamrut and green manuring, with minimal to no adoption among non-beneficiary farmers.

In terms of seed treatment, 38 per cent of beneficiaries practiced complete seed treatment using bio-fertilizers, while this practice was largely absent among non-beneficiaries. Mixed cropping was adopted by both groups; however, complete adoption was higher among beneficiaries (100%) compared to non-beneficiaries (92%). The application of growth-promoting inputs such as panchagavya, jeevamrut, amrutpani, and matka khad was commonly reported among beneficiary farmers, whereas these practices were almost entirely lacking among non-beneficiaries.

Regarding weed management, manual weeding was universally practiced by both categories of farmers. Mulching was fully adopted by all beneficiary farmers, while only 28 per cent of non-beneficiaries practiced it. For pest and disease management, practices including neem ark, dashparni ark, buttermilk spray, and trap cropping were predominantly adopted by beneficiaries. In contrast, non-beneficiaries exhibited very low or negligible adoption of these methods, except for neem ark, which was reported by all respondents.

Similarly, in the preparation of organic inputs such as FYM, vermicompost, jeevamrut, and panchagavya, beneficiary farmers demonstrated substantially higher adoption levels, whereas adoption among non-beneficiaries remained negligible in most cases.

**Table 1: Distribution of beneficiary and non beneficiary farmer according to Adoption of organic farming practices.**

Sr. No	Farmers' practice	Beneficiary (f)			Non beneficiary (f)		
		Full Adoption	Partial Adoption	No Adoption	Full Adoption	Partial Adoption	No Adoption
<b>1.</b>	<b>Field preparation</b>						
	Application of FYM	50 (100%)			16 (32%)	34 (68%)	
	Application of Vermicompost	31 (62%)	19 (38%)		5 (10%)	24 (48%)	22 (44%)
	Application of jeevamrut	13 (26%)	32 (64%)	5 (10%)		2 (4%)	48 (96%)
	Green manure	4 (8%)	46 (92%)			2 (4%)	48 (96%)
<b>2.</b>	<b>Seed treatment</b>						
	Treatment of seeds bio-fertilizers	19 (38%)	27 (54%)	4 (8%)		2 (4%)	48 (96%)
	Seed treatment with Panchagavya / beejamrut / jeevamrut	3 (6%)	39 (78%)	8 (16%)		3 (6%)	47 (94%)
<b>3.</b>	Practicing mixed cropping system	50 (100%)			46 (92%)	3 (6%)	
<b>4.</b>	<b>Growth promoting measures</b>						
	Application of Panchagavya	10 (20%)	40 (80%)				50 (100%)
	Application of Jeevamrut	12 (24%)	38 (76%)				50 (100%)
	Application of Amratpani		43 (86%)	7 (14%)			50 (100%)
	Application of Matka khad	5 (10%)	35 (70%)	10 (20%)			50 (100%)
<b>5.</b>	<b>Weed management</b>						
	Mulching with crop biomass	50 (100%)				14 (28%)	36 (72%)
	Manual weeding by cutting / uprooting	50 (100%)				50 (100%)	
<b>6.</b>	<b>Pest and disease management</b>						
	Use of bio pesticide		43 (86%)	7 (14%)			50 (100%)
	Use of Trap crops		28 (56%)	22 (44%)			50 (100%)
	Use of Neem ark	48 (96%)	2 (4%)				50 (100%)
	Use of Dashparni ark	4 (8%)	46 (92%)				50 (100%)
	Use of buttermilk	34 (68%)	16 (32%)				50 (100%)
<b>7.</b>	<b>Preparation of organic manure</b>						
	FYM	47 (94%)	3 (6%)		3 (6%)	12 (24%)	35 (70%)
	Vermicompost	24 (48%)	26 (52%)				50 (100%)
<b>8.</b>	Jeevamrut, beejamrut and panchagavya	23 (46%)	27 (54%)				50 (100%)

**Table 2: Distribution of beneficiary and non beneficiary farmer according to over all Adoption of organic farming.**

Sr. No.	Category	Range	Beneficiary (n=50)		Range	Non Beneficiary (n=50)	
			f	%		f	%
1.	Low	<60	12	24.00	<28	1	2.00
2.	Medium	60-66	28	56.00	28-32	42	84.00
3.	High	>66	10	20.00	>32	7	14.00
	<b>Total</b>		<b>50</b>	<b>100.00</b>		<b>50</b>	<b>100.00</b>
Mean-63 , S.D.- 2.73					Mean-29.86 , S.D.- 2.24		

The results demonstrate a distinct variation in the level of adoption of organic farming practices between PKVY beneficiary and non-beneficiary farmers. Among the beneficiary group, the majority (56%) were categorized under the medium adoption level, followed by 20 per cent in the high adoption category and 24 per cent in the low adoption category. The regular training programs, exposure to improved practices, and institutional support provided under the PKVY scheme appear to have facilitated greater adoption of advanced organic practices such as composting, application of bio-pesticides, green manuring, and diversified cropping systems. Conversely, a large proportion (84%) of non-beneficiary farmers were concentrated in the medium adoption category, indicating that although many of them practice traditional methods such as FYM application, crop rotation, and manual weeding, progression towards higher levels of adoption remains limited in the absence of organized technical support.

These findings are in agreement with the results reported by Sharma *et al.* (2011); Monikha (2016).

**Z-Test Result for Adoption of Organic Farming**

To evaluate the effect of PKVY on the adoption of organic farming practices, a two-sample z-test was employed to compare the mean adoption scores of beneficiary and non-beneficiary farmers. The analysis revealed that the mean adoption score of beneficiaries (62.56) was substantially higher than that of non-beneficiaries (29.86). The computed z-value (65.53) greatly exceeded the critical values at both 5 per cent (1.96) and 1 per cent (2.58) levels of significance, with a corresponding p-value of 0.000, indicating a highly significant difference between the two groups.

Accordingly, the null hypothesis of no significant difference between beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries was decisively rejected, thereby confirming the positive and significant influence of PKVY on the adoption of organic farming practices.

**Table 3: Z Test: Two Sample for Mean (Adoption of organic farming).**

	Adoption of Beneficiary	Adoption of non Beneficiary
Mean	62.56	29.86
Known Variance	7.43	5.02
Observations	50	50
Hypothesized Mean Difference	0	-
z	65.53119371	-
P(Z<=z) one-tail	0	-
z Critical one-tail	1.644853627	-
P(Z<=z) two-tail	0	-
z Critical two-tail	1.959963985	-

**Table 4: Difference in Two Sample Mean in Adoption of organic farming among PKVY Beneficiaries and Non-Beneficiaries.**

Sr. No.	Profile attributes	Mean value		Mean score difference	Z value
		PKVY Beneficiary	PKVY Non Beneficiary		
1.	Age	43.7	41.705	1.994	1.531 <sup>NS</sup>
2.	Education	2.42	2.647	-0.227	-1.094 <sup>NS</sup>
3.	Family size	5.66	5.745	-0.085	-0.417 <sup>NS</sup>
4.	Land holding	1.256	1.452	-0.196	-1.498 <sup>NS</sup>
5.	Area under organic farming	0.5176	0.0024	0.518	11.089 <sup>**</sup>
6.	Total Annual income	288000	250980.3922	37019.608	1.648 <sup>NS</sup>
7.	Experience in Organic farming	5.06	0.352	4.707	28.525 <sup>**</sup>
8.	Economic motivation	24.88	23.156	1.723	5.086 <sup>**</sup>
9.	Risk orientation	23.16	23.078	0.082	0.266 <sup>NS</sup>
10.	Innovativeness	22.54	21.215	1.324	3.396 <sup>**</sup>
11.	Environment Orientation	19.44	18.705	0.734	5.115 <sup>**</sup>
12.	Market Orientation	11.14	11.2156	-0.076	-0.392 <sup>NS</sup>
13.	Awareness of PKVY activity	18.8	11.294	7.506	34.390 <sup>**</sup>
14.	Extension contact	15.78	12.039	3.741	10.790 <sup>**</sup>
15.	Training on organic farming	3.34	0	3.340	18.997 <sup>**</sup>
16.	Attitude towards organic farming	27.44	25.196	2.244	5.158 <sup>**</sup>
17.	Knowledge of organic farming	18.7	12.6	6.1	24.00 <sup>**</sup>
	Adoption of organic farming	62.56	29.86	32.7	65.531 <sup>**</sup>

Table 4 shows the comparison of PKVY beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries across a variables including age, education, family size, landholding, area under organic farming, total annual income, experience in organic farming, economic motivation, risk orientation, innovativeness, environment orientation, market orientation, awareness of PKVY activities, extension contact, training on organic farming, attitude towards organic farming, knowledge of organic farming, and adoption of organic farming. The Z-test values for each variable were analyzed to determine whether the differences between the two groups were statistically significant.

The results revealed that age, education, family size, landholding, total annual income, risk orientation, and market orientation showed non-significant differences, indicating that both groups were statistically similar across these general socio-economic characteristics. In

contrast, a number of variables showed highly significant differences at the 1% level of significance ( $p \leq 0.01$ ), clearly favoring PKVY beneficiaries. These included area under organic farming, experience in organic farming, economic motivation, innovativeness, environment orientation, awareness of PKVY activities, extension contact, training on organic farming, attitude towards organic farming, knowledge of organic farming and adoption of organic farming (Sharma *et al.*, 2024). The high Z-values of these variables demonstrate that PKVY beneficiaries possess greater exposure, Economic motivation, knowledge of organic farming, environmental orientation, and significantly greater adoption of organic farming practices compared to non-beneficiaries. Overall, the findings indicate that the PKVY scheme has made a substantial and positive impact on the PKVY beneficiaries.

**Table 5: Coefficient correlation of independent variables and Adoption of organic farming.**

Variable no.	Independent variable	Correlation coefficient "r" values
X <sub>1</sub>	Age	0.198 <sup>NS</sup>
X <sub>2</sub>	Education	0.225 <sup>NS</sup>
X <sub>3</sub>	Family size	0.292*
X <sub>4</sub>	Land holding	0.296*
X <sub>5</sub>	Area under organic farming	0.288*
X <sub>6</sub>	Total Annual income	0.304*
X <sub>7</sub>	Experience of organic farming	0.321**
X <sub>8</sub>	Economic motivation	0.354**
X <sub>9</sub>	Risk orientation	0.095 <sup>NS</sup>
X <sub>10</sub>	Innovativeness	0.298*
X <sub>11</sub>	Environment orientation	0.372**
X <sub>12</sub>	Market orientation	0.296*
X <sub>13</sub>	Awareness of PKVY activities	0.291*
X <sub>14</sub>	Extension contact	0.289*
X <sub>15</sub>	Training on organic farming	0.293*
X <sub>16</sub>	Attitude towards organic farming	0.306*

\* Significant at 5% level, \*\* Significant at 1% level, NS = Not statistically significant

Age exhibited a significant positive association with knowledge of organic farming, indicating that older farmers possessed comparatively higher knowledge levels. This may be attributed to their accumulated farming experience, prolonged exposure, and deeper familiarity with traditional practices that closely align with organic methods. Their better understanding of soil, crops, and local climatic conditions further supports informed decision-making (Kharibam, 2021). Education showed a positive but non-significant relationship with knowledge, suggesting that formal education alone does not necessarily enhance organic farming knowledge. This implies that such knowledge is primarily acquired through practical experience, training, and extension services rather than conventional schooling. Farmers across all educational levels can effectively learn through demonstrations and hands-on activities (Naik, 2016).

Family size revealed a significant positive correlation with knowledge, implying that larger families contribute greater labour input and collective learning. Participation of multiple family members in farming activities facilitates knowledge sharing and joint decision-making, thereby enhancing awareness and

adoption of organic practices (Kharibam, 2021). Landholding size showed a non-significant positive relationship, indicating that farm size did not exert a strong influence on organic farming knowledge. Knowledge acquisition appears to be more dependent on farmers' interest and access to information rather than land area (Kharibam, 2021). In contrast, area under organic farming exhibited a highly significant positive correlation with knowledge, reflecting that farmers cultivating larger organic areas gained greater practical exposure, involvement in certification processes, and training opportunities, leading to enhanced knowledge levels (Sharma, 2022).

Annual income had a significant positive relationship with knowledge, suggesting that farmers with higher income possess better access to training, information sources, and organic inputs. Higher financial capacity facilitates experimentation with new technologies and enhances learning opportunities (Jakhar, 2024). Experience also showed a significant positive effect on knowledge, indicating that farmers engaged in organic farming for longer periods acquired greater technical and practical understanding through continuous practice, observation, and problem-solving (Jaganathan,

2009). Economic motivation was significantly correlated with knowledge, implying that financially driven farmers actively seek improved techniques, training, and certifications that enhance productivity and profitability, thereby strengthening their knowledge base (Sharma, 2022).

Risk orientation exhibited a weak and non-significant relationship with knowledge, indicating that risk-taking behaviour did not substantially influence organic farming knowledge levels (Kharibam, 2021). Innovativeness showed a strong and highly significant positive correlation, suggesting that innovative farmers were more receptive to new ideas, actively pursued training, experimented with improved methods, and consequently acquired higher knowledge (Naik *et al.*, 2016; Sharma, 2022). Environmental orientation also showed a highly significant positive relationship with knowledge, revealing that farmers having stronger environmental concern were more informed about sustainable practices such as composting, crop rotation, and eco-friendly pest management. Their ecological awareness motivated continuous learning and information seeking (Jaganathan *et al.*, 2012; Sharma, 2022).

Market orientation exhibited a significant positive relationship with knowledge, indicating that farmers aware of market demand, certification standards, and price advantages were more motivated to adopt improved organic practices and remain informed through market interactions (Jaganathan *et al.*, 2012). Awareness of PKVY activities also showed a significant positive correlation with knowledge, implying that informed farmers effectively utilized training programs, subsidies, and institutional support, thereby improving their knowledge level (Prasad, 2022). Extension contact was found to have a significant positive association with knowledge of organic farming, indicating that regular interaction with extension personnel facilitated access to updated technical information, field demonstrations, and practical guidance, playing a vital role in technology transfer (Prasad, 2022). Training displayed a direct and significant positive influence on knowledge, as structured training programs strengthened farmers' understanding of composting, bio-fertilizer use, pest management, and certification procedures, while also promoting peer learning and confidence building, interacting with experts and fostering mutual learning (Prasad, 2022).

Attitude showed a significant positive correlation with knowledge, suggesting that farmers with a favourable outlook towards organic farming were more willing to learn and adopt sustainable practices. A positive attitude promotes openness to innovation, participation in training, and continuous learning driven by belief in the long-term benefits of organic farming (Sharma *et al.*, 2024; Khadipure, 2020).

## CONCLUSIONS

The present investigation on the Paramparagat Krishi Vikas Yojana (PKVY) in Madhya Pradesh demonstrates its substantial role in advancing the

adoption of organic farming practices among rural farming communities. The results indicate that PKVY has effectively reduced farmers' reliance on chemical fertilizers and pesticides, thereby improving soil health, enhancing crop quality, and ensuring the long-term sustainability of agricultural production systems. Adoption of organic farming under the scheme contributed to economically viable farming by lowering input costs and enhancing market prospects through organic certification and premium price realization. Overall, PKVY has emerged as a significant intervention for promoting sustainable agriculture and strengthening rural livelihoods. Further strengthening of the programme through continuous monitoring, technical support, and robust market linkages would enhance its effectiveness and support national goals of doubling farmers' income and promoting chemical-free agriculture in India. The study emphasizes the critical role of socio-psychological and communicational factors in shaping sustainable farming behaviour. While PKVY has had a considerable impact on enhancing the adoption of organic farming among beneficiary farmers, in coming future addressing operational constraints through strengthened policies, infrastructure development, and farmer-oriented support systems is essential for scaling up organic farming in India.

**Acknowledgement.** Grateful acknowledgement to advisors for their constant guidance and invaluable support throughout the course of this research. Special thanks to the Department of Extension Education, College of Agriculture, Jabalpur, for providing the necessary facilities and a supportive academic environment, and to J.N.K.V.V., Jabalpur, for granting the opportunity and encouragement to carry out this study. Heartfelt thanks go to Mr. Govind Meena, SADO of ATMA in Narmadapuram, and his dedicated team for their assistance and cooperation during field visits. Also thank the PKVY beneficiary and non-beneficiary farmers whose participation, time, and insights made this research meaningful and successful, as well as to everyone who offered practical help and field-level support during the study.

**Conflict of Interest.** None.

## REFERENCES

- Anonymous (2024). Ministry of Agriculture and Farmers Welfare. Paramparagat Krishi Vikas Yojana. *Press Information Bureau, Ministry of Agriculture and Farmers Welfare*, (2024).
- APEDA (2023–2024). *National programme for organic production*. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.9734/jsrr/2024/v30i112597>
- Jaganathan, D. (2009). A multidimensional analysis of organic farming in Tamil Nadu. *PhD Thesis*. Indian Agricultural Research Institute, New Delhi.
- Jaganathan, D. Bahal, R. Roy, B. R. and Lenin, V. (2012). Knowledge level of farmers on organic farming in Tamil Nadu. *Indian Research Journal of Extension Education*, 12(3), 70–73.
- Jakhar, K. C. (2024). Effectiveness of Paramparagat Krishi Vikas Yojana (PKVY) in relation to organic farming in southern Rajasthan, *Ph.D. thesis*. Rajasthan college of Agriculture Maharana Pratap University of Agriculture and Technology Udaipur.
- Khadipure, P. (2020). An analytical study on organic farming of maize crop under Param paragat Krishi Vikas Yojana (PKVY). *M.Sc. (Ag) Thesis*, Rajmata Vijayaraje Scindia Krishi Vishwa Vidyalaya.

- Kharibam, K. D. (2021). A study on knowledge and adoption of organic farming practices of black rice (chak-hao) by the farmers of Manipur. *M.Sc. Thesis*, Assam Agricultural University Assam.
- Monikha, C. R. (2016). Determinants of Adoption of Organic Farming Practices in Western Zone of Tamil Nadu. Unpub. *M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis*, TNAU, Coimbatore.
- Naik, A. (2016). Knowledge and adoption of organic farming practices in red gram in dryland areas of karnataka. *M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis*, Professor Jayashankar Telangana State Agricultural University college of agriculture rajendranagar, Hyderabad.
- Prasad, G. (2022). A study on impact of Paramparagat Krishi Vikas Yojna (PKVY) with reference to organic farming among the farmer of Chhattisgarh. (*Ph.D. thesis*) Indira Gandhi Krishi Vishwavidyalaya, Raipur.
- Sansei, N. Plaza, B. G. and Polo, A. (2007). A comparative survey of recent result on humid like factions in organic amendment and effects on effects on native soil humid substances. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry*, 39(6), 1244-1262.
- Sharma, C. (2022). Assessment of Knowledge of Organic Farming Practices among Farmers of Jabalpur District of Madhya Pradesh. (*Ph.D. thesis*), Jawaharlal Nehru Krishi Vishwavidyalaya Jabalpur.
- Sharma, C. Khare, N. K. Naberia, S. and Raut, A. (2022). Communicational behavior of farmers of Jabalpur district. *Biological Forum-An International Journal*, 14(1), 1303-1307.
- Sharma, C. Naberia, S. and Bisht, K. (2024). Comparative analysis among proponents of organic and non-organic farming practices. *Gujarat Journal of Extension Education*, 37(2), 148-152.
- Sharma, C. Agrawal, S. and More, V. (2024). Factors affecting farmers' knowledge regarding organic farming practices. *Gujarat Journal of Extension Education*, 38(1), 63-69.
- Sharma, C. Naberia, S. Raut, A. Agrawal, S. and Bisht, K. (2024). Impediments encountered by farmers in implementation of organic farming practices and strategic recommendations essential to surmount them effectively. *International Journal of Extension Education*, 20(1), SI: 64-69.
- Sharma, C. Naberia, S. Raut, A. Agrawal, S. Rajan, P. and Bisht, K. (2024). Influence of attributes of innovation on the knowledge of farmers practicing organic farming in Jabalpur district. *Journal of Community Mobilization and Sustainable Development*, 19(2), 425-428.
- Sharma, P. Patel, M. M. and Singh, V. B. (2011). Entrepreneurial orientation of garlic producers. *Indian Journal of Extension Education*, 47(1&2), 107-112.
- Sharma, C. Khare, N. K. Naberia, S. and Raut, A. A. (2022). Identification and documentation of organic farming practices in wheat crop in Jabalpur district. *Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology*, 40(4), 47-53.
- Tiwari, A. K. (2023). The role of organic farming in achieving agricultural sustainability: Environmental and socio-economic impacts. *Acta Biology Forum*, 2(2), 29-32.

**How to cite this article:** Minal Kumbhare, Sonam Agrawal, Chandrika Sharma and Seema Naberia (2026). Adoption of Organic Farming: Assessing the Impact of Paramparagat Krishi Vikas Yojana (PKVY). *Biological Forum*, 18(2): 18-24.