



ISSN (E): 2277- 7695
ISSN (P): 2349-8242
NAAS Rating: 5.23
TPI 2022; SP-11(1): 562-566
© 2022 TPI

www.thepharmajournal.com

Received: 25-11-2021

Accepted: 27-12-2021

S Naveen Kumar

Senior Scientist and Programme
Coordinator, Krishi Vigyan
Kendra (KVK), Nizamabad,
PJTSAU, Telangana, India

P Gidda Reddy

Former Director of Extension,
ANGRAU, Hyderabad,
Telangana, India

R Ratnakar

Former Director, EEI,
ANGRAU, Hyderabad,
Telangana, India

Study on extension activities taken up by the NGO extension service providers in Andhra Pradesh

S Naveen Kumar, P Gidda Reddy and R Ratnakar

Abstract

Pluralism in agricultural extension services was studied using exploratory and descriptive research design in Andhra Pradesh state revealed that majority of the NGO extension service providers emphasized on; Cropping pattern, Organizational activities, Extension activities like trainings, products promotions, result and method demonstrations, field trials, field days, exposure visits etc. and agronomical practices. Followed by the watershed approaches, market led extension activities like; providing information on market intelligence was least prioritized.

Keywords: pluralism, NGO extension service providers (NESP)

Introduction

The purpose of focusing on pluralism is to take into consideration the jumble of ongoing activities, and rather than trying to gain control over them, to instead choose niches and to identify common concerns where different approaches may lead to synergy. Awareness of pluralism allows extension planners to admit that they cannot co-ordinate all the variables and perform all the functions. According to Umali and Schwartz (1994) ^[1] stated that farmers associations are traditionally organized around specific agricultural activities such as production, input supply, marketing, advocacy, and/or commodities such as food, livestock, credit and extension is frequently one of the multiple services they provide. In fact many of public or private or NGO organizations have been involving in delivering of agricultural extension services and uplift the farmers income together or individually. But major focus of any NGO is focus on localize and specific problem oriented, rendering services to find solution from available resources locally. Shashi Kumar and Hirevenkanagoudar (2003) ^[2] mentioned that the voluntary organizations involved in social development activities like education, health and sanitation, relief, slum improvement, housing and conference /seminar. Noorjehan Hanif *et al.* (2005) ^[3] mentioned that some of the functions of farmers club/ field schools are: to secure sustainability in natural resource through increase of production, productivity, reduction in cost of cultivation with low external inputs, adoption of organic farming, integrated pest and nutrient management practices, seed production and marketing of produce

Materials and Methods

The study was carried out to study the public, private, and NGOs as agricultural extension service providers in Andhra Pradesh as general objective and to study the different extension activities taken up by the NGO extension service providers as specific objective. The sampling procedure and design used was adopted from Naveen *et al.*, (2021) ^[4] in selection of state, districts, villages and private extension service providers and NGOs respondents comprising 15 from three districts were selected, thus making a total of 45 as a sample from each group.

Results and Discussion

Distribution of respondents of NGO Extension Service Providers based on the Activities

The results (Table 1) revealed that majority of the respondents of NGO extension service providers were found to be in the high category on activities viz; cropping pattern (84.4%), organizational activities (82.2%), extension activities (73.4%), agronomical practices (71.2%), watershed approach (46.7%) and input activities (37.8%).

Corresponding Author

S Naveen Kumar

Senior Scientist and Programme
Coordinator, Krishi Vigyan
Kendra (KVK), Nizamabad,
PJTSAU, Telangana, India

Table 1: Distribution of respondents of NGO Extension Service Providers based on the Activities

S. No	Activities	Category	Range	NGO ESP (n=45)	
				F	%
I	Organizational Activities	Low	16-26	3	6.7
		Medium	27-37	5	11.1
		High	38-48	37	82.2
II	Input Activities	Low	6-9	14	31.1
		Medium	10-13	14	31.1
		High	14-18	17	37.8
III	Farming Activities				
(A)	Watershed Approach	Low	6-9	11	24.4
		Medium	10-13	13	28.9
		High	14-18	21	46.7
(B)	Agronomical Practices	Low	14-22	2	4.4
		Medium	23-32	11	24.4
		High	33-42	32	71.2
(C)	Cropping Pattern	Low	4-6	-	-
		Medium	7-9	7	15.6
		High	10-12	38	84.4
IV	Extension Activities	Low	16-26	1	2.2
		Medium	27-37	11	24.4
		High	38-48	33	73.4
V	Market Intelligence	Low	8-12	16	35.6
		Medium	13-18	24	53.3
		High	19-24	5	11.1

But in case of market intelligence majority of them (53.3%) were distributed in to the medium category. It might be due to the broad areas of activities simultaneously covered by NGO extension service providers besides, agriculture other areas like health, education, small business activities etc.

I. Organizational Activities taken up by the NGO Extension Service Providers (NESP) were ranked based on the scores

It could be observed from the findings (Table 2) that NGO extension service providers responded on organizational activities such as; clarifying and promoting the role of science and technologies in agricultural development (I) and imparting diagnostic skills and demonstration skills etc. (I) were equally placed in first position. Later, conducting pre-seasonal and regular trainings/campaigns for extension functionaries (III), micro planning (IV) and process documentation (V) were ranked among the Sixteen Organizational activities. And the mean score on all organizational activities calculated was 110.

II. Input Activities taken up by the NGO Extension Service Providers (NESP) were ranked based on the scores

It could be seen from the findings (Table 3) that NGO extension service providers expressed that they were more focused on inputs activities such as; providing information on technological infrastructure (I) and followed by supply and distribution of seed, planting material, fertilizers and pesticides (II). Lastly, supply of farm equipment and implements, organic farm equipment, livestock feed and

veterinary supplies (III) were ranked among six input activities. And the mean score on all input activities was 90.

III. Farming Activities taken up by the NGO Extension Service Providers (NESP) were ranked based on the scores

It could be seen from the findings that NGO extension service providers explained the Farm activities in three different areas (A) Watershed Approach activities (B) Agronomical Activities and (C) Cropping Pattern activities. The results of (A) Watershed Approach activities (Table 4) revealed the fact that; promoting soil and water conservation through, waste land development, land leveling, watershed practices and sustainable use of land (I), tank Restoration and desilting activities (II), construction and renovation of percolation and irrigation tanks (III) and facilitating micro irrigation facilities i.e. drip irrigation and sprinkler irrigation (III) were ranked first, second and third respectively. And then mean score on all six watershed approach activities was 91.

It was explained from the findings of NGO extension service providers given responses to the (B) Agronomical Practices (Table 5) such as; providing information on new package of practices and appropriate technologies (I), creating awareness about new management practices like SRI (System of Rice Intensification) (II), creating awareness of traditional agricultural practices (ITKS) (III), providing information on spacing and planting (IV) and providing information on harvesting techniques (IV) were ranked among the Fourteen Agronomical Activities. And the mean score on all agronomical activities was 114.

Table 2: Ranks were given to organizational activities based on the scores given by the NGO ESP (F= Frequently, O= Occasionally and N= Never)

S. No.	Organizational Activities	NGO ESP(n=45)			Score	RANK
		F	O	N		
		Freq.	Freq.	Freq.		
1	Conducting staff orientation on the organization objectives	31 (68.88)	14 (31.11)	-	121	
2	Micro planning	34 (75.55)	10 (22.22)	1 (2.22)	123	IV
3	Clarifying and promoting the role of science and technologies in agricultural development	37 (82.22)	7 (15.55)	1 (2.22)	126	I
4	Conducting pre-seasonal and regular trainings/campaigns for extension functionaries	36 (80.00)	8 (17.77)	1 (2.22)	125	III
5	Process documentation	34 (75.55)	9 (20.00)	2 (4.44)	122	V
6	Exposure to modern electronic media and Audio Visual (AV) aids	22 (48.88)	11 (24.44)	12 (26.66)	100	
7	Facilitating financial assistance i.e. credit facilities to agricultural families	14 (31.11)	10 (20.00)	21 (46.66)	83	
8	Providing research and technological assistance to other NGOs/ organizations or key individuals	21 (46.66)	14 (31.11)	10 (22.22)	101	
9	Establishing a coordinating and linkage mechanisms with other institutions	33 (73.33)	6 (13.33)	6 (13.33)	117	
10	Providing financial assistance to other organizations	10 (22.22)	9 (20.00)	26 (57.77)	74	
11	Integrate the activities of public and private scientific institutions	23 (51.11)	12 (26.66)	10 (20.00)	103	
12	Facilitating interactions between local researchers and educators with the external agricultural research community	27 (60.00)	15 (33.33)	3 (6.66)	114	
13	Assisting the farmers in finding out schemes, programmes, getting application forms, filling, processing and sanction without any difficulty	26 (57.77)	17 (37.77)	2 (4.44)	114	
14	Assisting the farmers in getting subsidies, benefits and assistance from different schemes and developmental programmes	26 (57.77)	16 (35.55)	3 (6.66)	113	
15	Assisting in crop/live stock insurance for agricultural development to escape from risk	23 (51.11)	15 (33.33)	7 (15.55)	106	
16	Imparting diagnostic skills and demonstration skills etc.	36 (80.00)	9 (20.00)	-	126	I
Mean					110	

*Percentages in Parentheses

Table 3: Ranks were given to Input activities based on the scores given by the NGO ESP (F= Frequently, O= Occasionally and N= Never)

S. No.	Input Activities	NGO ESP(n=45)			Score	RANK
		F	O	N		
		Freq.	Freq.	Freq.		
1	Supply and distribution of seed, planting material, fertilizers and pesticides	19 (42.2)	15 (33.33)	11 (24.44)	98	II
2	Supply of farm equipment and implements, organic farm equipment, livestock feed and veterinary supplies	11 (24.44)	22 (48.88)	12 (26.66)	89	III
3	Seed production units/multiplications	8 (17.77)	15 (33.33)	22 (48.88)	76	
4	Supply of seed treatment material	12 (26.66)	10 (22.22)	23 (51.11)	82	
5	Supply of bio fertilizers, bio agents and bio pesticides	13 (28.88)	10 (22.22)	22 (48.88)	81	
6	Providing information on technological infrastructure	28 (62.22)	12 (26.66)	5 (11.11)	113	I
Mean					90	

*Percentages in Parentheses

Table 4: Ranks were given to Watershed approach activities based on the scores given by the NGO ESP (F= Frequently, O= Occasionally and N= Never)

S. No	Farming Activities	NGO ESP(n=45)			Score	RANK
		F	O	N		
		Freq.	Freq.	Freq.		
(A)	Watershed Approach					
1	Promoting soil and water conservation through, waste land development, land leveling, watershed practices and sustainable use of land	26 (57.77)	6 (13.33)	13 (28.88)	103	I
2	Construction and renovation of percolation and irrigation tanks	20 (44.44)	10 (22.22)	15 (33.33)	95	III
3	Regeneration of fallow lands and land reclamation to improve green cover	11 (24.44)	19 (42.22)	15 (33.33)	86	
4	Facilitating micro irrigation facilities i.e. drip irrigation and sprinkler irrigation	15 (33.33)	20 (44.44)	10 (22.22)	95	III
5	Digging of new wells and deepening of old wells	7 (15.55)	10 (22.22)	28 (62.22)	69	
6	Tank Restoration and desilting activities	20 (44.44)	15 (33.33)	10 (22.22)	100	II
Mean					91	

*Percentages in Parentheses

Table 5: Ranks were given to activities of Agronomical Practices based on the scores given by the NGO ESP (F= Frequently, O= Occasionally and N= Never)

S. No	Farming Activities	NGO ESP(n=45)			Score	RANK
		F	O	N		
(B)	Agronomical Practices	Freq.	Freq.	Freq.		
1	Providing information on soil and agro climatic zone	21 (46.66)	11 (24.44)	3 (6.66)	88	
2	Providing information on seed treatment	35 (77.77)	6 (13.33)	4 (8.89)	121	
3	Providing information on spacing and planting	35 (77.77)	7 (15.55)	3 (6.66)	122	IV
4	Providing information on nursery management	30 (66.66)	10 (22.22)	5 (11.11)	115	
5	Providing information on weed control practices	32 (71.11)	8 (17.77)	5 (11.11)	117	
6	Providing information on nutrient management	28 (62.22)	14 (31.11)	3 (6.66)	115	
7	Conducting irrigation water analysis	18 (40.00)	15 (33.33)	12 (26.66)	96	
8	Providing information on new package of practices and appropriate technologies	39 (86.66)	5 (11.11)	1 (2.22)	128	I
9	Providing information on growth regulators	20 (44.44)	14 (31.11)	11 (24.44)	99	
10	Providing information on harvesting techniques	32 (71.11)	13 (28.88)	-	122	IV
11	Providing information on Post Harvest Technology (PHT), value addition techniques and export orient products	26 (57.77)	11 (24.44)	8 (17.77)	108	
12	Creating awareness about new management practices like SRI (System of Rice Intensification)	35 (77.77)	10 (22.22)	-	125	II
13	Creating awareness of traditional agricultural practices (ITKS)	34 (75.55)	11 (24.44)	-	124	III
14	Providing information on bio fertilizers and bio control practices	29 (64.44)	14 (31.11)	2 (4.44)	117	
Mean					114	

*Percentages in Parentheses

Finally, (C) Cropping Pattern Activities of Farming activities were expressed as (Table 6); Promoting subsidiary farming activities (dairy, poultry, vegetable production, organic farming, sericulture, fodder cultivation, prawn culture, social forestry, and nursery techniques) (I) and providing

information on inter cropping (II) and providing information on crop rotation (II) were ranked first and second among the four cropping pattern activities and mean score was calculated as 124.

Table 6: Ranks were given to activities of Cropping Pattern based on the scores given by the NGO ESP (F= Frequently, O= Occasionally and N= Never)

S. No	Farming Activities	NGO ESP(n=45)			Score	RANK
		F	O	N		
(C)	Cropping Pattern	Freq.	Freq.	Freq.		
1	Providing information on inter cropping	38 (84.44)	7 (15.55)	-	128	II
2	Providing information on crop rotation	38 (84.44)	7 (15.55)	-	128	II
3	Providing information on contingency plan	25 (55.55)	12 (26.66)	8 (17.77)	107	
4	Promoting subsidiary farming activities(dairy, poultry, vegetable production, organic farming, sericulture, fodder cultivation, prawn culture, social forestry, and nursery techniques)	42 (93.33)	3 (6.66)	-	132	I
Mean					124	

*Percentages in Parentheses

IV. Extension Activities taken up by the NGO Extension Service Providers (NESP) were ranked based on the scores

It was known that NGO extension service providers shown their responses on Extension Activities (Table 7) such as; screening of agricultural films, slide shows and radio talks (I), encouragement of natural fertilizing methods and sustainable Natural Resource Management (NRM) (II), awareness creation in which experts meet farmers to diagnose and solve their problems (III), providing information on plant protection measures and Integrated Pest Management (IPM) (IV), organizing groups, facilitating group meetings, and village meetings (V) and community mobilization for various development activities (V) were ranked among the Sixteen extension activities and mean score of all extension activities was 121.

V. Market Intelligence Activities taken up by the NGO Extension Service Providers (NESP) were ranked based on the scores

It was explained that the results of market intelligence activities shown (Table 8) such as; providing information on other market opportunities (I), providing information about market prices of different commodities (II) and providing information about demand products in market (III) were ranked first, second and third among the eight market intelligence activities and mean score was calculated 77.

Conclusion

It is clearly denoting the fact that the NGO Extension Service Providers (NESP) focused on different extension activities and emphasized on cropping pattern, organizational and input activities. Lastly, market intelligence and watershed activities

were focused. It could be the NGO extension service providers have been focused in many of the extension and agronomical activities because of their commitment and welfare obligations towards their clientele. These functionaries have to work with the clientele or clientele

groups and hence should possess good working knowledge and skill in cropping pattern, low cost agronomical practices and watershed approaches in the wake of WTO where the principle is higher productivity at a lower cost.

Table 7: Ranks were given to Extension Activities based on the scores given by the NGO ESP (F= Frequently, O= Occasionally and N= Never)

S. No	Extension Activities	NGO ESP(n=45)			Score	RANK
		F	O	N		
		Freq.	Freq.	Freq.		
1	Conducting Reconnaissance (survey of an area)	32 (71.11)	10 (22.22)	3 (6.66)	119	
2	Identification of farmer volunteers and meeting with opinion leaders	30 (66.66)	15 (33.33)	-	120	
3	Identifying right clients and stakeholders/target people	34 (75.55)	11 (24.44)	-	124	
4	Organizing groups, facilitating group meetings, and village meetings	35 (75.55)	10 (22.22)	-	125	V
5	Community mobilization for various development activities	38 (84.44)	6 (13.33)	1 (2.22)	125	V
6	Awareness creation in which experts meet farmers to diagnose and solve their problems	37 (82.22)	8 (17.77)	-	127	III
7	Conducting onfarm demonstration trails, field days and video presentations, to promote its products	34 (75.55)	5 (11.11)	6 (13.33)	118	
8	Conducting study tours and field trips	30 (66.66)	7 (15.55)	8 (17.77)	112	
9	Promotion of women participation in agriculture and women empowerment activities	33 (73.33)	11 (24.44)	1 (2.22)	122	
10	Conducting soil testing surveys, melas and rythusadassu	30 (66.66)	6 (13.33)	9 (20.00)	111	
11	Screening of agricultural films, slide shows and radio talks	33 (73.33)	13 (28.88)	9 (20.00)	134	I
12	Receiving feed back regularly	31 (68.88)	11 (24.44)	3 (6.66)	118	
13	Conducting impact studies	27 (60.00)	11 (24.44)	7 (15.55)	110	
14	Distributing farm literature	31 (68.88)	13 (28.88)	1 (2.22)	120	
15	Providing information on plant protection measures and Integrated Pest Management (IPM)	36 (80.00)	9 (20.00)	-	126	IV
16	Encouragement of natural fertilizing methods and sustainable Natural Resource Management (NRM)	39 (86.66)	5 (11.11)	1 (2.22)	128	II
Mean					121	

*Percentages in Parentheses

Table 8: Ranks were given to Market Intelligence activities based on the scores given by the NGO ESP (F= Frequently, O= Occasionally and N= Never)

S. No	Market Intelligence Activities	NGO ESP(n=45)			Score	RANK
		F	O	N		
		Freq.	Freq.	Freq.		
1	Providing information on cold storage and warehousing facilities	6 (13.33)	12 (26.66)	27 (60.00)	69	
2	Providing information on transport and weighment facilities	4 (8.88)	8 (17.77)	33 (73.33)	61	
3	Providing information about export facilities	8 (17.77)	11 (24.44)	26 (57.77)	72	
4	Providing information about market prices of different commodities	17 (37.77)	11 (24.44)	17 (37.77)	90	II
5	Providing information about processing and grading facilities	6 (13.33)	16 (35.55)	23 (51.11)	73	
6	Providing information about deficiency products in market	8 (17.77)	10 (22.22)	27 (60.00)	71	
7	Providing information about demand products in market	15 (33.33)	13 (28.88)	17 (37.77)	88	III
8	Providing information on other market opportunities	13 (28.88)	20 (44.44)	12 (26.66)	91	I
Mean					77	

*Percentages in Parentheses

References

- Umali DL, Schwartz L. Public and Private Agricultural Extension; Beyond Traditional Frontier: World Bank Discussion Papers, the World Bank Washington DC, 1994.
- Shashi Kumar S, Hirevenkanagoudar LV. Role of Non Government Organizations in entrepreneurship development; Agricultural extension review, 2003, 6-10.
- Naveen Kumar S, Gidda Reddy P, Ratnakar P. Study on Different Extension Activities Taken up by the Private Extension Service Providers in Andhra Pradesh. The Pharma Innovation Journal. 2021;10(4):1248-1253
- Noorjehan Hanif AKA, Mohamed Iqbal I, Athimuthu P. Extension through Farmers Organizations: National Seminar on Extension Pluralism for Rural Development Feb 25-26, 2005 Society of Extension Education TNAU campus Coimbatore, 2005.