

## EVALUATION OF THE WORKING OF EXTENSION FIELD STAFF FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF FARMING COMMUNITY

Manzoor-Ahmad

*College of Veterinary Sciences, Lahore*

This study was conducted to evaluate the working of the Extension Field Staff of the Department of Agriculture, Lahore. An analysis of the data collected through interview schedule administered to 120 farmers disclosed that 27.5% respondents knew the Field Assistants both by face and name. Similarly, only 11.67% respondents knew the Agricultural Officers of the area by face only. Large majority of the respondents had never visited the Extension Field Staff. It is suggested that working of the Extension Field Staff must be checked by the higher authorities. Moreover, the Field Staff must keep the record of their daily activities.

### INTRODUCTION

Pakistan is primarily an agricultural country. The development of farming largely depends upon the extent of adoption of modern techniques, the communication of which depends on the efficiency of Agricultural Extension Field Staff. This could be evaluated by determining the opinion of the farmers about the actual working of the Field Staff. Therefore, this study was undertaken to know the functioning of the Field Staff, their effectiveness in terms of their contacts with the farming community resulting in the adoption of recommended practices, drawbacks, if any, and make suitable recommendations for improving the extension service.

### MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study was conducted in ten villages of Tehsil Lahore. Twelve farmers were individually interviewed at random from each village, using the interview schedule. Thus, in all 120 farmer-respondents made the sample of the study. The data were tabulated, analysed and interpreted by using simple percentages.

### RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1 indicates that majority of the respondents (52.5 and 80.0%) did not know Field Assistants and Agricultural Officers respectively, neither by face nor by name. Only 20% farmer-respondents knew Field Assistants by face only and 27.5% knew them both by face and name. Similarly, Agricultural Officers were known by face only to 11.67% and both by face and name to 8.33% of the farmer-respondents. These findings are partly in agreement with those of Masud (1973) and Hussain (1983).

Table 2 reflects that only 39.17 and 23.33% of the farmer-respondents were aware of the duties of the Field Assistants and Agricultural Officers respectively. These results conform to those of Shafi (1969).

Analysis of the data shown in Table 3 reveals that a large majority of the farmer-respondents reported that most of the Field Assistants and Agricultural Officers never visited the farmers. There were only 15.84 and 12.5% of the farmer-respondents who acknowledged that Field Assistants visited them weekly and yearly respectively. These observations are in line with those recorded by Jamil (1972).

Table 1. Acquaintance of the farmer-respondents with the extension field staff

Extension field staff	Category of acquaintance									
	Only by name		Only by face		Both by face and name		No acquaintance		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Field Assistants	-	-	24	20.00	33	27.50	63	52.50	120	100
Agricultural Officers	-	-	14	11.67	10	8.33	96	80.00	120	100

Table 2. Awareness of farmer-respondents about the duties of extension field staff

Extension field staff	Aware		Not aware		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Field Assistants	47	39.17	73	60.83	120	100
Agricultural Officers	28	23.33	92	76.67	120	100

Table 3. Frequency of visits paid by extension field staff to the farmer-respondents

Frequency of visits	Field Assistant		Agricultural Officer	
	No.	%	No.	%
Daily	1	0.83	-	-
Weekly	19	15.84	2	1.67
Fortnightly	1	0.83	1	0.83
Monthly	3	2.50	3	2.50
Quarterly	5	4.17	3	2.50
Half yearly	3	2.50	3	2.50
Yearly	15	12.50	3	2.50
Never	73	60.83	106	88.33
Total	120	100.00	120	100.00

Table 4 shows that a great majority of the farmer-respondents (~57%) were of the view that the Agricultural Extension Service at present was probably not very useful for the development of agriculture. Only a few (15%) farmer-respondents agreed that extension service was doing something for the development of agriculture. These findings are in line with those recorded by Jamil (1972) and Ahrnad (1977).

Table 4. Extent of usefulness of Agricultural Extension Service for the development of agriculture

Extent or usefulness	Number	%
To a great extent	7	5.83
To some extent	11	9.17
Not at all	102	85.00
Total	120	100.00

The following conclusions were drawn from this study:

1. Majority of the farmer-respondents (52.2 and 80.0%) was not acquainted with the Field Assistants and Agricultural Officers.
2. Only 39.17 and 23.33% farmer-respondents were aware of the duties of the Field Assistants and Agricultural Officers respectively.
3. Majority of the farmer-respondents

(60.83 and 88.33%) were never visited by the respective Field Assistants and Agricultural Officers.

4. A large majority of the farmer-respondents (85%) did not like the present working of extension field staff. Only 15% of them agreed that extension service was useful to them.

## REFERENCES

- Ahmad, I. 1977. Attitude of extension worker towards the necessity of inservice training. M.Sc. (Agri. Ext.) Thesis, Univ. of Agri., Faisalabad.
- Hussain, A. 1983. An appraisal of working image of Extension Field Staff as perceived by the local councillors of Chichawalni Tehsil M.Sc. (Agri. Ext.) Thesis, Univ. of Agri., Faisalabad.
- Jamil, M. 1972. A study of the role of Field Assistants in Agricultural Extension in Toba Tek Singh Tehsil. M.Sc. (Agri. Ext.) Thesis, Univ. of Agri., Faisalabad.
- Masud, K. 1973. Study of the image developed by the Agricultural Extension Field Staff in two villages of a union council of Samundry Tehsil, M.Sc. (Agri. Ext.) Thesis, Univ. of Agri., Faisalabad.
- Shafi, M. 1969. A study of the effects of Agricultural Extension activities on the development of farming community in Campbellpur Tehsil M.Sc. (Agri. Ext.) Thesis, WPAU, Lyallpur (Faisalabad).