

# PRODUCTIVITY OF SMSs WORKING UNDER T & V SYSTEM IN GUJARAT STATE

M. N. Popat<sup>1</sup>, H. L. Patel<sup>2</sup> and S. R. Patel<sup>3</sup>

## INTRODUCTION

The Subject Matter Specialists (SMS) in Training and Visit system of extension (T&V) is an important link between university scientists and extension personnel. The SMSs acquire the technical know how from scientists during monthly workshop and in turn communicate the same to village extension workers (VEWs)/ agricultural extension offices (AEOs) during fortnightly training. Thus, the success of T&V system largely depends on the quality and competency of the SMSs. In order to know the extent and manner of job performance and level of productivity of SMSs, the present investigation to study the productivity of Subject Matter specialists was undertaken.

## METHODOLOGY

The study was conducted in all the six zonal T&V training centers of GAU. The SMSs having a minimum of two years experience in T&V system of which one year experience at the present place of posting, constituted the total population of the study. Out of 88 eligible SMSs 77 SMSs were selected randomly for the study.

To measure the level of productivity of SMSs, a scale developed for the purpose was

used. The data related to productivity were obtained directly from SMSs using structured questionnaire during monthly workshop at the six training centers viz., Anand, Vadodara, Navsari, Junagadh, Rajkot and Sardar Krushinagar.

The scale had three main indicators as SMSs have to perform three activities viz., field activities, training activities and contact with research. The field activities contained ten job items, whereas training activities and research activities contained nine and ten job items, respectively. In order to assign the rank to various activities the standard partial regression coefficient ( $b'$ ) was calculated.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Level of productivity

The data regarding level of productivity are reported in Table 1. The data in Table 1 reveal that majority (70.13 per cent) of the SMSs exhibited medium level of productivity. The almost equal numbers of respondents were in low (15.58 per cent) and high (14.29 per cent) level of productivity group.

The scores obtained by the respondents on productivity varied from 1008 to 7512 with mean score of 3376.44 which indicate the

**Table 1** Distribution of SMSs at different levels of productivity N=77

Sr.No.	Category	Frequency	Per cent
1	Low	12	15.58
2	Medium	54	70.13
3	High	11	14.29
Mean = 3376.44		S. D. = 1642	CV = 48.63

1 Associate Extension Educationist, Extension Education Institute, GAU, Anand

2 Ex-Principal, Extension Education Institute, GAU, Anand

3 Senior Research Assistant, Extension Education Institute, GAU, Anand

Table 2 Field activity wise analysis of productivity

N=77

Sr. No.	Field Activities	Mean productivity Score	Standard partial regression coefficient	Rank
1	To solve the problems raised by farmers	417.04	0.3731	II
2	To examine proper implementation of the recommendations by contact farmers	935.75	0.7139	I
3	To check the regular visit of VLWs/ AEOs to farmers	179.36	0.1522	III
4	To see whether recommendations taught to farmers by VLWs are correct	203.49	0.1465	IV
5	To find out constraints in adoption of various recommendations and suggest suitable modification	100.52	0.0971	V
6	To help and guide VLWs/ AEOs in organizing agricultural exhibition, film show and group discussion	40.13	0.0478	VI
7	To give radio talk and TV program in the field of specialization	1.77	0.0020	IX
8	To represent the extension activities of other institutions	3.05	0.000074	X
9	To accompany the dignitaries during their visit and acquaint them with activities	4.59	0.0041	VIII
10	To organize field trips of farmers to visit farm fairs, agricultural exhibition, farmers day etc.	6.07	0.0049	VII

moderate level of respondents' productivity. The standard deviation and coefficient of variation show the heterogeneity of the group.

### Activity wise analysis

#### Field activity

The information pertaining to the field activities is presented in Table 2. The data in Table 2 reveal that the first rank was received by the job item 'to examine proper implementation of the recommendations by contact farmers'. The probable reason for this might be that the technology should be implemented by the contact farmers and then be transferred to other farmers. Hence, contact farmers must implement the technology as per the recommendations and it is the important duty of SMSs to check whether the contact farmers are implementing the recommendations properly or not.

The job item 'to solve the problems raised

by farmers' was ranked second. The reason for this might be that the recommendations taught to farmers by VLWs might not be correctly understood by them and there is possibility of doubts. Hence, the problems raised by the farmers may be the key problem.

The item "to give radio talk and TV program in the field of specialization" attained ninth rank which might be due to the fact that all SMSs may not get opportunity to give radio talk or a TV program.

#### Training activity

The information on productivity on nine job items of training activities is presented in Table 3.

The data in Table 3 apparently revealed that the job item 'to prepare necessary teaching aids' stood first. It is probably due to the fact that SMSs wish to present their knowledge/ information to VLWs/ AEOs regarding latest recommendations easily

**Table 3 Analysis of Training Activities for its' Productivity N=77**

Sr. No.	Training Activities	Mean productivity Score	Standard partial regression coefficient	Rank
1	To attend fortnightly training session regularly	192.20	0.1966	V
2	To arrange skill teaching in order to teach the skill to trainees in fortnightly training	60.35	0.1195	VII
3	To prepare necessary teaching aids	231.12	0.5074	I
4	To distribute summary of recommendations and impact points to trainees	106.63	0.2048	IV
5	To guide VLWs in preparing annual plan for contact farmers	213.52	0.4475	II
6	To give the solution of samples brought by VLWs	112.58	0.2365	III
7	To participate in district /regional technical committees	2.96	0.0027	IX
8	To attend the training / workshop organized in out of the state	0.62	0.0060	VIII
9	To prepare agricultural literature to keep farmers informed by latest researches	54.70	0.1480	VI

and effectively so that they in turn can communicate the same in a convincing manner to contact farmers.

"To guide VLWs in preparing annual plan for contact farmers' obtained second position. This might be due to the view that by preparing annual plan, the contact farmers can get practical experience of farm planning.

"To attend the training/ workshop organized in out of state' and 'to participate

in district/ regional technical committees' obtained 8<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> rank, respectively. This might be due to the fact that all SMSs could not get an opportunity to participate in the same.

#### Contact with research

The information regarding contact with research is presented in Table 4.

The data in Table 4 reveal that the job item 'to arrange mini kit demonstration' get first rank. The probable reason for this might be

**Table 4 Productivity of activities regarding contact with research N=77**

Sr. No.	Activities regarding contact with research	Mean productivity Score	Standard partial regression coefficient	Rank
1	To attend training session on monthly workshop regularly	46.05	0.0213	VIII
2	To participate in state level extension/ research workshop	5.98	0.0185	IX
3	To arrange farm trials on farmers' field	30.72	0.4490	VI
4	To organize field day on the farm of farmers on which farm trials are arranged	22.90	0.0785	II
5	To arrange mini kit demonstration	323.80	0.9430	I
6	To arrange parietal trials	20.19	0.0537	IV
7	To arrange adaptive trials	9.94	0.0403	V
8	To organize joint field visits with research scientists	4.90	0.0061	X
9	To visit research stations	18.00	0.0353	VII
10	To bring problems revealed in field visits and fortnightly training to the notice of researchers	26.52	0.0539	III

**Table 5 Overall mean productivity score of main activities**

Sr.No.	Main activities	Mean productivity score	Per cent	Rank
1	Field activities	1891.77	56.03	I
2	Training activities	975.68	28.90	II
3	Contact with research	509.00	15.07	III

that SMSs may be eager to demonstrate the results of latest recommended technologies to the farmers. The job item to organize 'field day on the farm of farmers on which farm trials are arranged' received second rank. This may be due to the fact that the actual impact of the technological package in comparison to local practices can be shown to the farmers through the field day. Further, it also helps to disseminate the messages on latest agricultural technology to many other farmers.

The participation in the state level extension/research workshop received next to last rank. It is interesting to note that the job item 'to organize joint field visits with research scientists' received last position among all the ten activities.

#### **Overall productivity of main activities**

The information regarding overall mean productivity of main three activities reported in Table 5 indicates that the field activities stood first with 56.03 per cent of overall

productivity among all the three main activities. This was followed by training activities (28.90 per cent) and activities of contact with research (15.07 per cent).

#### **Conclusion**

The study conducted to measure the productivity of SMSs working under T & V system of Gujarat State leads us to conclude that majority (70.13 per cent) of the SMSs exhibited medium level of productivity. So far as activity wise analysis is concerned 'to examine proper implementation of the recommendations by contact farmers' stood first among all ten field activities. In training aspect 'to prepare necessary teaching aids' was the major activity. So far as activities regarding contact with research are concerned 'arranging mini kit demonstrations' stood first. Among all these main activities field activity were the major concerned of SMSs which stood first in overall productivity.

-----