Madras agric J. 62 (10—12) : 629—633, Oct—Dec., 1975.

Study on the Process and Technique of Demonstration in Coimbatore District

By

D. SOMASUNDARAM[1], and K. N. DURAISWAMY[2]

ABSTRACT

The study indicated the lack of planning and supervision in the conduct of demonstration. Preparation and use of calendar of work was not a common practice amoung gramasevakes. Little attention seems to have been paid to the follow-up of the demonstration. Generally it can be concluded that the demonstrations by and large are being cosidered by gramasevaks to be an end in themselves and not a means to educate the farmers.

INTRODUCTION

In majority of the studies, taken up to identify the most effective methods for rapid diffusion of agricultural technology, demonstration was found to be the best method for convincing the farmers about the adaptability of the practices demonstrated in their own situation. The knowledge and understanding of the process, that is, the steps involved in conducting a demonstration, are important requriements for its success. Therefore, it was considered necessary to investigate the knowledge and understanding of the gramasevaks regarding these steps.

Deshmukh and Raheja (1963) found that the effectiveness of demonstration was reduced by improper planning; suitable persons were not selected as demonstrators; the field trips to the demonstrations were not properly arranged and local leaders were not taken into confidence in the programme. Kumar (1964) in his study found that neither the village level worker, nor the demonstrating farmer properly understood the result demonstration. Demonstrating farmer did not explain the purpose of the demonstration. Many village level workers even did not know important steps of conducting demonstration.

MATRIALS AND METHODS

The study was taken up in two blocks in Coimbatore district in Tamil Nadu, selected on purposive sampling technique. A sampling fraction of 16.7 per cent of villages, with probability proportional to the number of villages in each block, was adopted in fixing up

1. Assistant Professor, Agricultural Extension Education. 2. Former Director of Extension Education, Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Coimbatore-641003.

the number of villages. As such three villages were selected in each block using the random principles. All the nineteen gramasevaks working in these two blocks, 19 farmer demonstrators who had conducted the composite demonstrations in all the six selected villages were selected as respondents for the study. The data for the composite demonstrations conducted in the year 1968-69 were collected through interview schedules. Considering the size of the sample, the data were analysed using percentage analysis.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Determining the need for demonstrations: Only 42.1 per cent of the gramasevaks had determined the need prior to laying out the plots. Regarding the technique followed for this majority of them (75 per cent) reported that they had ascertained the need for conducting the demonstration out of their peersonal experience.

Selection of the farmer demonstrator: All the gramasevaks had considered the qualities of 'genuine interest in the programme', helpful in extending the results' and 'willing to persistantly following the recommended techniques', in selecting the farmer demonstrators. 'Prepared to take risk' and 'representative of the community' were the qualities considered by 94.9 per cent of the respondents. While 'prepared to record facts' quality was considered by 84.4 per cent of them. Leadership quality was considered comparatively by least number of respondents (68.4 per cent).

Selection of site: All most all of the gramasevaks had cosidered all the criteria *viz.*, road side plot, free from trees, representative of the conditions, levelled fields, uniform fertility, not likely to be used as a foot path and not surrounded by crops liable to be attacked by pests and diseases, while selecting the site for conducting demonstrations. All the gramasevak respondents had educated and oriented the farmer demonstration. Only 15.8 per cent of the gramasevaks furnished the written plan of work to the farmer demonstrators, so as to ensure that all practices are adopted in full without any omission. Regarding preparation of the calendar of work, only 36.8 per cent of them prepared the calendar of work while others did not follow this step. While conducting the demonstration, all the gramasevaks who had prepared the plan of work had reviewed it as a last minute check up to avoid any omissions in the plan. All the gramasevaks used sign boards (Table 1).

In no one stage the farmers were invited by all the gramasevaks. A large proportion of the gramasevaks (89.5

Table 1. Stpes followed by gramasevaks in conducting the demonstrations

Particulars	No. of respondents followed (n=19	% followed
Educating and orienting the demonstrators	19	100.0
Using a written plan of work	3	15 8
Preparation of calendar of work	7	36.8
Reviewing the written plan of work before commencing the demonstration	19	100.0
Using sign boards	19	100.0
Inviting the farmers during		
a) sowing	16	84.2
b) transplanting	17	89.5
c) growing phase	9	47.4
d) harvesting	17	89.5
Inviting the farmers		
a) by beating the drum	4	21.0
b) by personal contact	18*	94.7
c) by casual announcement in farmers meeting	3	15.8
d) by AIR broadcast	2	10.5
e) by writing letters	1	5.3
Maintenance of demonstration register		
a) by extension worker	19	100.0
b) by farmer demonstrator as instructed by extension workers	9	47.0

* Five respondents used more than one method for inviting farmers.

per cent had invited the farmers during transplanting and harvesting stage. Importance of inviting farmers during growth phase so as to impress upon them about the performance of the crop, were neglected to a greater extent.

Most of gramasevaks invited farmers only by personal contact method. The ideal way of communicating through locally available means was used by only 21 per cent of them. Radio was utilized by only 10.5 per cent of the gramasevaks. All the gramasevaks had maintained the prescribed demonstration registers. Only 47.4 per cent of the gramasevaks had entrusted this works to the farmer demonstrators, while the rest had not done so.

Supervision of the demonstration: It may be noted that in no one stage hundred per cent of the plots were reported as supervised by the gramasevaks. From the different statements of the gramasevaks and the

Table 2. 'When supervised' as reported by gramasevaks and farmer demonstrators

Stage of demonstration	No. of demonstration plots supervised as reported by	
	Gramaseveks (n=146 plots)	Composite demonstration plot farmer demonstrators (n=19)
Preparatory cultivation	125	2
Sowing	129	8
Basal dressing	125	8
Top dressing	119	5
Intercultivation	62	1
Plant protection operations	122	6
Harvesting	136	7

farmer demonstrators, it may be safely concluded that the supervision of the demonstration plots at various stages by gramasevaks was not adequate (Table 2).

Completing the demonstrations: The table-3 reveals that only 46.1 per cent of the gramasevak had taken photos during important stages of demonstration so that they could be utilized for convincing the farmers who might not have visited the plot during the time of demonstration. The main reason attributed by the remaining gramasevaks for not taking photos was the non-availability of facilities such as camera and photo films.

Table 3. Completing the demonstration

Particulars	No. of respondents reported (n=19)
Taking photos :	
a. Taken photos	8
b. No photo was taken	11
Total	19
Area harvested :	
a. Entire area	10
b. Only twenty cents	1
c. Only ten cents	3
d. Only five cents	4
e. Only one cent	1
Total	19
Organizing field days :	
a. Organized field days in all plots	9
b. Organized in one plot	1
c. Organized only for Paddy and Maize crops	4
d. No field day organized	5
Total	19
Establishing proof of net gain :	
a. Worked out the economics	16
b. Not worked out the economics	3
Total	19

More than half of the gramasevaks (52.6 per cent) had harvested the whole plot to establish the superiority of the demonstrated practices over the local and the rest (47.4 per cent) had harvested only a portion of the plot. Whatever be the area harvested, the yield particulars seems to have been estimated for one acre and entered in the demonstration register. Only 47.4 per cent of the gramasevaks had organized the field days in all the plots at the time of harvest by inviting the farmers to the demonstration site and explaining the different practices demonstrated. It was organized only in few plots by 26.3 per cent of the gramasevaks. Whereas no field day was organized by equal number of gramasevaks (26.3). Except in a very small proportion (15.8 per cent), majority of the gramasevaks (84.2 per cent) had worked out the economics for demonstration plots to establish the better economic returns of the practices demonstrated.

Follow-up : Follow-up of demonstration is necessary not only to ascertain the overall impact of the demonstration, but also to find out and enlist farmers who would like to follow the practices demonstrated. It is

Table 4. A Follow-up of demonstration

Particulars	No. of respondents followed (n=19)
Enlisting the probable adopters	6
Writing of success stories	1
Broadcasting the yield data over AIR	3
No follow-up	9
Total	19

evident that to take follow-up action, 31.7 per cent of the gramasevaks had enlisted the probable adopters. Only 5.2 per cent and 15.8 per cent of them had communicated the message by writing success stories and broadcasting over AIR respectively (Table 4).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The senior author expresses his sincere gratitude to the I. C. A. R. for the award of a junior fellowship during the tenure of the M.Sc. (Ag.) course.

REFERENCES

DESHMUKH, V. R. and P. C. RAHEJA. 1963 Relative effectiveness of demonstrations for introducing seeds, fertilizers and implements and factors associated with the non-adoption of them, *Indian J. Agron.* 8 : 410.

KUMAR, K. V. 1964 A critical analysis of the process and technique of result demonstration, *M. Sc. Thesis.*, I. A. R. I., New Delhi.