

## Role Expectation and Role Performance of Agricultural Leaders\*

By

S. SOMASUNDARAM<sup>1</sup>, K. N. DURAISWAMY<sup>2</sup> and K. RADHAKRISHNA MENON<sup>3</sup>

### ABSTRACT

The agricultural leaders have performed their expected roles in popularising di-ammonium phosphate in the following order as : advisor (79 per cent), innovators (66 per cent) group teacher (64 per cent), group spokesman (38 per cent), fact seeker (19 per cent) and for popularising IR 8 rice as an advisor (48 per cent), group teacher (43 per cent), group spokesman (26 per cent), innovator (24 per cent), fact seeker (21 per cent) and helping extension personnel to lay demonstrations (17 per cent). There is a significant difference in the performance of the role as group teacher, advisor, innovator for the two selected agricultural extension programmes.

### INTRODUCTION

The rationale for the study lies in the fact that introduction of change in agriculture and its acceptance by the majority of the farmers in the community is controlled to a greater extent by the performance of different roles by different agricultural leaders. Different agricultural leaders may perform different roles which may either retard or promote the agricultural extension programme. Since the local agricultural leaders constitute a major determining factor in spreading and accepting changes in agriculture, it is of vital importance to the extension workers to understand the leader's role in the community. In the present study, the term 'roles' had been

operationally defined as the 'actual functions' performed by the agricultural leaders. The two dimensions of role analysed in this study are, the importance of role and frequency of role performance which correspond the role expectation and role behaviour respectively. The dimension 'importance' reflects the ought to do part of the concept and the frequency of role performance in actual behaviour reflects the 'does' part of the concept.

### MATERIALS AND METHODS

Key informant method was utilised to identify agricultural leaders and their followers were personally interviewed by the authors, and the responses col-

\*Forms part of M. Sc. (Ag.) Dissertation approved by the University of Madras.

1. Instructor, Department of Agricultural Extension, Agricultural College and Research Institute., Madurai. 2. Formerly Registrar, Tamil Nadu Agricultural University. 3. Associate Professor of Agricultural Extension Agricultural College and Research Institute, Coimbatore-641003.



lected with the help of pre-tested, interview schedule. The area of the study was limited to one Panchayat Union in Thanjavur district. Based on the identified roles by Reddy (1964) through the use of critical incidental technique in his study and based upon the experts opinion in the field, a tentative list of roles of agricultural leaders were prepared and the same was shown to the then deputy agricultural extension officer of the panchayat union to rate on a three points scale. The roles which were considered as not at all important by the Deputy Agricultural Extension Officer were deleted. The difference in the

performance of roles by the leaders was statistically analysed.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The roles as group teacher, advisor, innovator, group spokesman and fact seeker were rated as important roles and hence they are expected to be performed more frequently by the agricultural leaders in both the selected agricultural extension programmes. In addition to these five roles, one more role, i.e. helping the extension personnel was stated as 'important in respect of programme 2 (popularising IR 8 paddy).

TABLE 1. Role performance by agricultural leaders

Name of the role		Percentage of leader performed the role			Chi-square value
		More frequently	Less frequently	Not performed	
Group teacher	P <sub>1</sub>	64	33	3	19.59**
	P <sub>2</sub>	43	21	36	
Advisor	P <sub>1</sub>	79	17	4	12.12**
	P <sub>2</sub>	48	45	7	
Innovator	P <sub>1</sub>	66	31	3	31.6 **
	P <sub>2</sub>	24	31	45	
Group spokesman	P <sub>1</sub>	38	21	41	2.37 NS
	P <sub>2</sub>	26	24	50	
Fact seeker	P <sub>1</sub>	19	19	62	0.5 NS
	P <sub>2</sub>	21	19	60	

P<sub>1</sub>=Programme for popularising Di-ammonium phosphate

P<sub>2</sub>=Programme for popularising IR 8 rice

\*\*= Significant at 1 per cent level

NS=Non-significant



**Group teacher:** A maximum number of the agricultural leaders performed this role more frequently in  $P_1$  than in  $P_2$ . There is a significant difference in performing this role. The possible reason for a reduction in  $P_2$  may be that the agricultural leaders themselves were unable to get a clear conclusion about the suitability of IR 8 rice variety for their tract.

**Advisor:** The performance of this role by the leaders in  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  were not the same and the difference was significant. The reason for the less frequent performance and non-performance of this role in  $P_2$ , may be due to the negative opinion of agricultural leaders, since the performance of IR 8 rice in Tanjore area is erratic and also is often unpredictable.

**Innovator:** The difference in performance of this role in the selected programmes is also significant. It is concluded that introduction of a change in the fertilizer is taken more readily by the agricultural leaders while a change in rice strain is resisted more by agricultural leaders.

**Group spokesman:** A majority of the agricultural leaders did not perform this role at all. The difference is also not significant. It is felt that only by representing difficulties in getting and using di-ammonium phosphate and IR 8 rice by the leaders, it is possible for the extension personnel to find out the solution to the problems and base the agricultural extension programme on actual needs of the farmers. Agricultural leaders could be persuaded and encouraged to speak for their group.

**Fact seeker:** The difference in performance of this role is not statistically significant. Fact seeker's role in this study denotes meeting the extension personnel to know more about the fertiliser di-ammonium phosphate and IR 8 rice. Since the percentage of the performers of this role among the identified agricultural leaders in both the programmes was least, it could be concluded that these leaders would have utilised other sources of impersonnel communication.

#### **Helping extension personnel to lay demonstration for IR 8 rice:**

This role was expected to be performed only in  $P_2$ . Only a few agricultural leaders performed this role more frequently and one third of them helped extension workers only at times and the rest never helped the extension personnel. Among the non-performers, many agricultural leaders were willing to help but the location of their land was not suitable. So it is not possible to conclude that majority of them were not willing to help the extension personnel to lay demonstrations with IR 8 rice.

The roles as group teacher, advisor, innovator, group spokesman, fact seeker were stated as important roles in both the selected agricultural extension programmes. In addition to these roles, one more role i.e., 'helping the extension personnel to lay demonstration' is stated as important one in  $P_2$  (popularisation of IR 8). As such these roles were expected to be performed more frequently by every identified agricultural leader.

In more frequent performance of the roles, group teacher and advisor,