

A Study on the Process and Technique of Demonstration in Coimbatore District

By

D. SOMASUNDARAM and K. N. DURAISWAMY

ABSTRACT

The study revealed that only two thirds of the gramasevaks regarded demonstration as the most important extension method used by them in their extension work. Their perception about the importance of demonstration was not influenced by their age, education, inservice training, tenure as a gramsevak and grade. But majority of them expressed that the purpose of demonstration was to provide local proof and to convince the most sceptical farmers.

INTRODUCTION

Result demonstration was found to be the most effective technique for rapid diffusion of agricultural technology in majority of the investigations. Kumar (1964) in his study found that all the village level workers regarded demonstration as the most important extension method. Regarding the purpose of the Result demonstration, he reported that it was not fully understood by the village level workers. Salvi and Dudhani (1967) found out that the job effectiveness of village level worker did not appear to be a function of his age. But they reported a positive association between the formal education of a V. L. W. and his job effectiveness. They also revealed that the extent of a V. L. Ws. tenure in extension was not associated with his effectiveness. Patel and Leagans

(1968) reported that V.L.Ws. with extension training are likely to be more effective than those having no training. The specific objectives of this study are: to analyse the importance and purpose of Composite Demonstration as perceived and understood by the gramsevak and to analyse the personal factors of the gramsevak associated with their perception about the importance of demonstration.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The investigation was taken up in two blocks in Coimbatore district. The blocks were selected on purposive sampling method. All the nineteen gramsevak working in these two selected blocks formed the respondents for this study. Data were collected with the help of an interview schedule, and their significance wherever possible.

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

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

To know the perception of the gramsevak about the importance of the demonstration as extension method, they were asked to name three important extension methods, used by them in their extension work. Mention of

Table 1. Perception of the important extension methods by gramsevak.

Extension methods	No. of respondents (n=19)	%
Individual contact	16	84.2
Demonstration	13	68.4
Group contact	13	68.4
Film show	4	21.9
Pamphlet distribution	1	5.3
Exhibition	1	5.3
No third method expressed	6	31.6
No second and third method expressed.	2	10.6

the demonstration as one of the three extension methods by the gramsevak was taken as an indication of their perception of this method. Their responses are given in the (Table 1).

From their responses it is found out that only 68.4 per cent of the gramsevak perceived the importance of demonstration and reported it as one of the three important extension methods used by them.

Further probe revealed that of the gramsevak who had reported the demonstration as one of the extension methods, only 46.1 per cent of them

assigned first priority to demonstration, while relatively a higher number of them (53.9 per cent) gave second and third priorities to it (Table 1). Hence it is evident that the unique position of the demonstration as an effective extension method has not been well understood by the gramsevak and hence there exists difference in assigning the priority among them.

It is clear that 79 per cent (73.7+5.3) of them had understood the purpose more clearly as providing local proof and its educational value while

Table 2. Purpose of Demonstration as understood by gramsevak

Purpose of Demonstration	No. of respondents	Percentage
To provide local proof to the farmers.	14*	73.7
To bring the farmers very close to the extension workers.	12*	63.1
To convince the farmers having no faith in the departmental recommendations.	1	5.3

*Eight respondents reported more than one purpose.

63.1 per cent of them had emphasised only one aspect of bringing the farmers close to the extension workers (Table 2).

Personal factors of the gramsevak associated with their perception about the Demonstration: Age, education, inservice training, tenure as a gramsevak and the grade

of the gramsevak were selected to study their association with the perception about the demonstration.

The perception of the importance of demonstration was more among the

Table 3. Personal factors of the gramsevak in relation to the perception of the importance of Demonstration

Personal factors of the gramsevak	No. of respondents expressing perception	Percentage
Age		
a) Young (upto 25) (n=1)	0	0
b) Middle (26-35) (n=14)	11	78.6
c) Old (above 35) (n=4)	2	50.0
Education		
a) Secondary (n=17)	11	64.7
b) Collegiate (n=2)	2	100.0
Inservice training		
a) Trained (n=14)	11	78.6
b) Untrained (n=5)	2	40.0
Tenure as a gramsevak		
a) Upto 3 years (low) (n=2)	1	50.0
b) Above 3 years upto 6 years (Medium) (n=14)	3	75.0
c) Above 6 years (high) (n=13)	9	69.2
Grade of the Gram sevak		
a) Second grade (n=13)	8	61.5
b) First grade (n=6)	5	83.3

middle age group (78.6 per cent than in the old age group (50 per cent) (Table 3). Only 64.7 per cent of the gramsevak with secondary education had perceived the importance of demonstration, while it was cent per cent among the gramsevak with collegiate education. Understanding was more (78.6 per cent) among the trained gramsevak than in the case of untrained gramsevak (40 per cent). The trend of perception among the gramsevak of different tenures showed increase from the low (50 per cent) to medium (75 per cent) and decrease from the medium to high (69.2 per cent). Eventhough, there was a decline in the perception of gramsevak of higher tenure group, it was better than that of low tenure group. First grade gramsevak had more perception (83.3 per cent) than the second grade gramsevak (61.5 per cent).

REFERENCES

- KUMAR, K. V. 1964. A critical analysis of the Process and Technique of Results Demonstration *M. Sc. thesis*, I. A. R. I., New Delhi.
- PATEL, I. C. and J. P. LEAGANS 1968. Some background and personal traits related to village level workers' effectiveness, *Indian J. Extn. Ed.* 4: 10.
- SALVI P. V. and C. M. DUDHANI 1967. Role of personal characteristics in the job effectiveness of Village Level Workers, *Indian J. Ext. Ed.* 3: 127-31.