

VIEWS OF FARMERS ON THE STRUCTURE OF PRIVATE EXTENSION SERVICE ORGANIZATION

Madhusmita Sahoo* Reema Barik** Indira Priyadarsini Pattnaik***Santosh Kumar Rout****

1. M.Sc. in Agricultural Extension and Communication, Institute of Agricultural sciences, SOA University
2. M.Sc. in Agricultural Extension and Communication, Institute of Agricultural sciences, SOA University
3. M.Sc. in Agricultural Extension and Communication, Institute of Agricultural sciences, SOA University
4. professor (agricultural extension), Institute Agricultural Sciences, SOA University
Bhubaneswar, Odisha

ABSTRACT:

The present study was conducted during the year 2018-2020 in Khordha district of Odisha to know the “views of farmers on the structure of private extension service organisation”. The number of respondents were selected by proportional and random sampling method. Descriptive as well as inferential statistical tools were employed in order to attain the objective of the study. the data was analysed by using frequency, percentage, mean, standard deviation and correlation test. The study reveals that as much as (90%) of the respondents have expressed that the private extension service organization should be a registered one. Further (63.33%) of the respondents believe that the state government should have control over private extension service organization in some other form to avoid the exploitation. (90%) of the respondents have the ranked training as the first requirement. (73.33%) of the respondents have expressed that the extension service organizations should provide information’s to the farmers once a fortnight. (93.33%) of the respondents have preferred that the block headquarter should be the operational area.

INTRODUCTION:

In the era of the 21st century, a most developing country has already introduced privatization in agricultural extension services. However there are some loopholes for which privatization does not fit into them. The situation demands a

structural change in a private extension service organization. According to Le Gouis (1991), “the privatization of extension appears to be governed by the major policy initiatives like cost recovery, revitalization, commercialization, voucher system, etc. Public financing by the tax payer only for the kind of services that are strongly concerned with the general public, direct charging for some individual services with direct return in the form of improved income with the possibility of different rates for specific situations or direct groups and mixed funding shared between public and private professional association contributions for selected areas such as human investments, applied research, training the farmers and agents, etc.”

In general the public sector is based on the overall development of the farmers with free service. The demand for fees for providing services is new to the public sector. All the government organization, including NGOs, is providing free service to the farmers. Of course, presently, with the involvement of NGOs, some activities are being undertaken on public-private partnership mode. So it is necessary to know the views of farmers on the structure of private extension service organization.

MATERIALS AND METHODS:

The research study purposively is conducted on the Khordha districts of Odisha. The study consisted of farmers community only. As many as one hundred twenty respondents were selected for the study, who cooperate in providing meaningful information per the study’s requirement. The Khordha sub-divisions, blocks, gram panchayats, villages and respondents were selected based on the purposional and random sampling method.

blocks	Gram panchayats	No. of respondents
BEGUNIA	BEGUNIA	14
	KANTABADA	10
	BAGHAMARI	6
KHURDA	KAIPADAR	10

SADAR	BAJAPUR	12
	NANDAPUR	8
JATNI	CHATABARA	11
	GANGAPADA	6
	JANLA	13
BHUBANESWAR	CHANDAKA	19
	MENDHASALA	11

Survey cum ex-post facto research design was followed for the study. The response was collected from each selected respondents through a pretested interview schedule. The data was collected, processed and analysed with the help of appropriate statistical tools such as frequency, percentage, mean score, standard deviation and rank order.

RESULT AND DISCUSSIONS:

Structure of privatization

Table 1

Sl. No	Structure	Frequency	Percentage
1	PESO should be register one	108	90
2	State government should have control over PESO	76	63.33

The views of respondents on the structure of private extension service, as much as 90% of the respondents have expressed that the private extension service organization should be a registered one. Further, 63.33% of the respondents believed that the state government should control private extension service organization in some other form to avoid the exploitation. The reaction is quite genuine and the respondents are willing to have private extension service organization with certain government control.

Kind of technical support required for PESO

Table 2

Sl. No	Item	Frequency	Percentage
1	Information	104	86.67
2	Training	108	90
3	Marketing	72	60

Analysis of the table above reveals that as much as 90% of the respondents have ranked training as the first requirement followed by info 86.67% and marketing support 60% respectively. However the result as a whole indicates that in all the areas mentioned above, the private extension service organizations should come forward to meet the need of the farming community's need.

Frequency of extension service to the farmers

Table 3

Sl. No	Frequency of service	Frequency	Percentage
1	Every day	0	0
2	Once a week	24	20
3	Once in fortnight	88	73.33
4	As and when required	32	26.67

The table above indicates that 73.33% of the respondents have expressed that the extension service organizations should provide information's to the farmers once in a fortnight. 26.67% believe it should be done as and when required on demand and 20% once in week. So far as technical information is concerned none of the respondents have opted to get the service every day because farmers are satisfied to take the service once in a fortnight, resulting from focus group discussion.

Location of PESO

Table 4

Sl. No	Area	Frequency	Percentage
1	Block head quarter	112	93.33
2	Districts head quarter	72	60
3	At a middle area of operation	40	33.33

The table above reveals that 93.33% of the respondents have preferred that the block headquarter should be the operational area (unit area) followed by district head quarter 60% and a middle area of the operation of village and block that may be at panchayat level 33.33%. It can be concluded that depending on the availability of technical man power, communication facilities and the distance from the villages, the district headquarter or block should be chosen as the area of operation.

Facilities expected from PESO

Table 5

Sl. No	Facilities	Frequency	Percentage
1	Information	56	46.66
2	Input	104	86.67
3	Farm machinery	104	86.67
4	Fisheries	24	20

The table above reveals an equal percentage of the respondents have viewed the facilities should be extended on inputs and farm machinery(86.67%). 46.66% of the respondents believe that technological information should be provided to the farmers as and when necessary.

CONCLUSION:

The consequences of the study are good indications of expression of the sample regarding desirable units that PESO should have to serve the farmers.

The findings concerning PESO structure as expressed as expressed by the sample reveal that it should be registered one. Further, it reveals that PESO should be located at block headquarter and district headquarter-Facilities expected from PESO mostly from input and farm machinery. The extension services need to be provided once a fortnight. Farmer expresses that desirable facilities at PESO should be on input, farm machinery and fisheries.

REFERENCES:

- Baxter M. 1987. Emerging priorities for developing countries in agricultural extension. In: W, R. Rivera and S. G. Schram (ed.) *Agricultural Extension Worldwide: Issues, Practices and Emerging Priorities*, Croom Helm, New York
- Diana C. 1998. Changing Public and Private Roles in Agricultural Seed Provision. *Overseas Development Institute Publication*, Portland House, Stag Place, London, pp. 1-8
- Horna DJ and Oppen VM. 2004. Sketching private participation in agricultural extension in Nigeria and Benin. *Deutscher Tropentag*, Berlin, 5-7 October, 2004
- Legouls M. 1991. Alternative financing of Agricultural extension :Recent trends and implications for the future. In Rivera WM and Gustafson DJ. (eds.) *Agricultural Extension : World Wide Institutional Evolution and Forces for Change*, *Elsevier Science Publishers*, Amsterdam, Netherlands, pp.31-42.
- Maalouf WD, Contado TE and Adhikarya R. 1991. Extension coverage and resource problems. The need for public-private cooperation. In : Rivera WM and Gustafson DJ. (eds) *Agricultural Extension : World Wide Institutional Evolution and Forces For Change*. *Elsevier Science Publishers*, London.
- Ravikumar KN, Sreelakshmi K and Sastry NTV. 2001. Establishment of agricultural extension clinics need of the hour. *Agricultural Extension Review*. **13**(5): 9-12

Saravanan R. 2010. Agricultural knowledge information systems and innovations for technology dissemination and sustainable agriculture development. Published in "ISDA 2010", Montpellier, France.

Singh AK and Narain S. 2011. Capacity and Willingness of Farmers to Pay for Extension. *Indian Research Journal of Extension Education*. **11(3)**: 60-64

Singh SK, Singh R and Kushram P. 2017. Privatization Of Extension Services In India: Prospects And Challenges. *Trends in biosciences*. Pp5604-5606

Uddin E. 2013. Prospects And Challenges Of Privatization Of Agricultural Extension Services. *Asian Journal of Agriculture and Rural Development*. **3(7)**:477-487