



ISSN (E): 2277- 7695
ISSN (P): 2349-8242
NAAS Rating: 5.23
TPI 2021; 10(8): 1912-1918
© 2021 TPI

www.thepharmajournal.com

Received: 02-06-2021

Accepted: 09-07-2021

S Naveen Kumar

Senior Scientist and Programme
Coordinator, Krishi Vigyan
Kendra (KVK), Nizamabad,
PJTSAU, Telangana, India

P Gidda Reddy

Former Director of Extension,
ANGRAU, Hyderabad,
Telangana, India

R Ratnakar

Former Director, EEI,
ANGRAU, Hyderabad,
Telangana, India

Linkage mechanisms and compatibility factors among public, private and NGO extension service providers

S Naveen Kumar, P Gidda Reddy and R Ratnakar

Abstract

Trials and demonstrations, DLCC meetings, training programmes and joint field visits/farm visits were the strong linkage mechanisms, whereas, SLCC meetings, SLTP meetings and SAC meetings appears to be weak linkage mechanisms in public extension service providers. Linkage mechanisms such as, training programmes, trails and demonstrations, monthly workshops and joint field visits were strong, while, SLTP meetings, SLCC meetings and SAC meetings were weak linkage mechanisms in private extension service providers. Training programmes, monthly workshops and DLCC meetings were strong linkage mechanisms, whereas, SLTP meetings, SLCC meetings and SAC meetings were weak linkage mechanisms in case of NGO extension service providers. Public extension service providers have strongly associated with SAUs/ICAR research institutes, local/district administrations and media, whereas, less linkage/association was seen with commodity boards, financial institutions and input agencies. Private extension service providers had great linkages with development departments followed by media and farmers associations, while, less linkage with financial institutions, commodity boards and SAUs/ ICAR institutions. Whereas NGO extension service providers had strong association with other NGOs, development departments and farmers associations. In case of institutions like commodity boards, financial institutions and input agencies, NGO extension service providers had weak association. The compatibility factors such as honest and hard work and regular meetings, consultations and discussions ranked first. While, mutual understanding, building consensus, commitment to action, clear objectives, attitude towards collectivism, change proneness, managerial competencies and friendly relationship with others ranked second. Whereas accessing resources and opportunities ranked third, among the eleven compatibility factors identified for the purpose of public extension service providers. Regarding private extension service providers, the compatibility factors like; change proneness, accessing resources & opportunities and managerial competencies ranked first. Whereas, honest and hard work and regular meetings, consultations and discussions, ranked second. While third rank was given to mutual understanding, building consensus, commitment to action, clear objectives, attitude towards collectivism and friendly relationship with others. In case of NGO extension service providers viz; mutual understanding, building consensus, commitment to action, clear objectives, honest and hard work, regular meetings, consultations and discussions, attitude towards collectivism and friendly relationship with others ranked first. While, accessing resources & opportunities and managerial competencies got second rank. Third rank was given to change proneness among the eleven compatibility factors. There was a significant difference among the three extension service providers regarding over all compatibility factors.

Keywords: Pluralism, public, private and NGOs linkages and compatibility factors

Introduction

Agricultural Extension system in India, since its inception to till date, has transformed into different shapes during various agricultural developmental phases according to the needs and interests of the farming community. For the past one and half decade onwards changes have been taking place in every sphere of all the three sectors i.e. Agriculture (primary sector), Industries (secondary sector) and Services (tertiary sector). Secondary and tertiary sector contribution to Gross Domestic Product (GDP) is more when compared to primary sector. Agriculture contribution to GDP drastically comes down from 50 percent to 21 percent over the last decade. But the work force in agricultural sector is 65 percent, whereas industries constitute 15 percent and 25 percent in services. Industries and services sectors had captured the abundant opportunities out of information revolution. So it is the time for agriculture sector should explore benefits out of information revolution. Here, agricultural extension has to play pivotal role being a liaison department of research and farming community.

Corresponding Author:

S Naveen Kumar

Senior Scientist and Programme
Coordinator, Krishi Vigyan
Kendra (KVK), Nizamabad,
PJTSAU, Telangana, India

It should be in the form of pluralistic way i.e. combined effort of various departments or organizations or institutions for the same objective i.e. to expose farming community to international market standards and opportunities.

Now only extension system came into limelight as a pluralistic approach but it is an inherent feature of extension. The purpose of focusing on pluralism is to take into consideration the jumble of ongoing activities, and rather than trying to gain control over them, to instead choose niches and to identify common concerns where different approaches may lead to synergy. Awareness of pluralism allows extension planners to admit that they cannot co-ordinate all the variables and perform all the functions. Various pluralities inherent in extension make it difficult to assess the performance of extension. Being a fence sitter, extension by virtue of its role in development and also because of its innate pluralities often fails to produce tangible evidences of its efficiency and effectiveness. This is precisely why extension has always been amenable for debate and criticism. One must realize that extension alone cannot do anything as it depends for its very existence on at least two partners: the innovation system (research system and even the indigenous knowledge system) and the recipient system (rural and farm families). The other two partners of rural and agricultural development gamut like the government, market and input systems significantly influence its performance. At this juncture the concept of linkage of various departments who have been working together for agriculture and rural development was evolved under ATMA system from government side, whereas ICAR came up with ATIC and intervention of private players like input companies, agencies and NGO's for agricultural development came in to the picture.

Anonymous (1997) ^[3] stated that there are at least four types of linkages which every extension system must develop and maintain. They must have "Enabling linkages" with government cooperatives or the private sector to give them the right to exist and to provide them financial support. They must have "Functional linkages" with universities and other research systems. "Normative linkages" with colleagues in other related professions, as well as "Diffuse linkages" with farmers and other clientele groups. Abdul Kareem (2005) ^[1] explained that the concept of linkage implies that the communication and working relationship established between two or more organizations pursuing commonly shared objectives in order to have regular contact and improved productivity. The linkage between actors and services can be differentiated as follows: Public-Public, Private-Private, NGO-NGO, Public-Private, Public-NGO, Private-NGO, and Public-Private-NGO. Kumar and Sekar (2005) ^[4] observed that linkage may be conveying, consulting, training, leading, defending, knowledge building, practicing and using. The linkage may establish the working relationship or functional relationship between and among the sub systems (extension, research, input supply, credit, infrastructure, market, etc.) for a purposive interaction. Further, Samanta and Sontakki (2005) ^[6] stated that present extension scenario calls for private-public partnership, diversification, intensification, Natural Resource Management (NRM), research on consumer preferences and continuous capacity building of all the

stakeholders in the agricultural development. It is expected to change itself to respond to global changes and act as an integral component of extension-farmer-research-education-market linkage chain.

Materials and Methods

The study was carried out to study the public, private, and NGOs as agricultural extension service providers in Andhra Pradesh as general objective and to enlist existing linkages and find out the compatibility among the extension service providers as specific objective. Exploratory and descriptive research design was adopted for conducting the study. It serves as a basis for clarifying concepts, establishing priorities, gathering information about research in reality and to describe accurately the parameters or issues involved in the problem selected for research.

The sampling procedure adopted as Naveen *et al.*, (2020) ^[5] in selection of state, districts, villages and private extension service providers. This study was undertaken mainly to involve four categories of respondents namely; Public extension service providers (DAATTC Scientists, ADA's, ADH's, AO's, HO's and KVK scientists), Staff of Private extension service providers and consultants of NGOs who have been providing agricultural extension services to Farmers. In each district, 15 extension functionaries from government institutions and 15 from NGOs were selected, thus making a total of 45 as a sample from each group.

Results and Discussion

The results (Table 1) indicated that the linkage mechanisms of three extension service providers; The linkage mechanisms like trials and demonstrations (129), DLCC meetings (128), training programmes (127), joint field visits / farm visits (126), monthly workshops (120), ZREAC meetings (118), exhibitions and rythusadassu (108), SAC meetings (108), SLTP meetings (103) and SLCC meetings (102) were ranked as I,II, III, IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, IX and X based on the scores given by the respondents of public extension service providers. Trails and demonstrations, DLCC meetings, training programmes and joint field visits/farm visits were the strong linkage mechanisms, whereas, SLCC meetings, SLTP meetings and SAC meetings appears to be weak linkage mechanisms in public extension service providers. The public extension service providers involved in linkage activities like trials and demonstrations with private input dealers and NGOs. Those are demonstrations, farmer's fair, agricultural exhibition, training farmers' visits and meetings practiced for the betterment of agriculture in the region. DLCC (District Level Coordination Committee) meetings conducting in every month at district head quarter inviting agricultural department officers, university extension functionaries and private input dealers etc. Conducting training programmes for own extension functionaries, NGO functionaries and input dealers at local stations and training institutes at state level. Going for joint field visits / farm visits associating with scientists. Whereas they had weak linkage mechanism with SLCC meetings, SLTP meetings and SAC meetings. Because these meetings happened to be yearly once/half yearly once.

Table 1: Linkage Mechanisms among Extension Service Providers

S. No.	Linkage Mechanisms	Public ESP (n=45)		Private ESP (n=45)		NGO ESP (n=45)	
		Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank
1	Joint field visits / farm visits	126	IV	94	IV	110	IV
2	Monthly work shops	120	V	98	II	112	II
3	ZREAC (Zonal Research and Extension Advisory Committee) meetings	118	VI	53	VII	78	VII
4	Training programmes	127	III	109	I	123	I
5	Trials and demonstrations	129	I	98	II	104	V
6	Exhibitions and Rythusadassu	108	VII	94	IV	87	VI
7	DLCC(District Level Coordinated Committee) meetings	128	II	60	VI	111	III
8	SAC (Scientific Advisory Council) meetings	108	VII	45	VIII	70	VIII
9	SLCC (State Level Coordinated Committee) meetings	102	X	45	VIII	67	IX
10	SLTP (State Level Technical Programme) meetings	103	IX	45	VIII	64	X
	Mean	117		74		93	

*Percentages in Parentheses

Majority of the respondents of private extension service providers have indicated linkage mechanisms like; training programmes (109), trials and demonstrations (98) as well as monthly workshops (98), joint field visits / farm visits and exhibitions (94), exhibitions and rythusadassu (94), DLCC meetings (60), ZREAC meetings (53), SAC meetings (45), SLCC meetings (45) and SLTP meetings (45) in order of I, II, III, IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, IX and X ranks respectively. These linkage mechanisms ranked based on the scores they obtained. Linkage mechanisms such as, training programmes, trails and demonstrations, monthly workshops and joint field visits were strong, while, SLTP meetings, SLCC meetings and SAC meetings were weak linkage mechanisms. Private extension service providers having strong linkage mechanisms in respect to conducting frequent training programmes with NGOs followed by trials and demonstrations as well as monthly workshops, joint field visits / farm visits and participating in exhibitions and rythusadassu when ever conducted by university. Similarly, private extension service providers also weak in linkage mechanisms like SLTP meetings, SLCC meetings and SAC meetings, with which they no way concern.

The respondents of NGO extension service providers have mentioned that training programmes (123), monthly workshops (112), DLCC meetings (111), joint field visits/farm visits (110), trials and demonstrations (104),exhibitions and rythusadassu (87), ZREAC meetings (78), SAC meetings (70), SLCC meetings (67) and SLTP

meetings (64) were ranked as I, II, III, IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, IX and X respectively. Training programmes, monthly workshops and DLCC meetings were strong linkage mechanisms, whereas, SLTP meetings, SLCC meetings and SAC meetings were weak linkage mechanisms. Most of the NGO extension service providers strongly involved in linkage mechanism like training programmes at agricultural department, CAPART, and at other NGOs, monthly workshops, DLCC (District Level Coordination Committee) meetings, joint field visits / farm visits conducted by departmental officials and trials and demonstrations. Whereas, poor linkage mechanisms with SLTP meetings, SLCC meetings and SAC meetings. Because these were especially mentioned for public extension service providers.

Linkage Institutions/organizations

Findings (table 2) revealed that most of the respondents of public extension service providers have indicated their extent of linkages with other institutions such as; SAUs/ICAR research institutions (116), local/district administrations(111), media(111), farmers associations (107), development departments (104), NGOs (99), input agencies (88), financial institutions (79) and commodity boards (75) and were ranked as I,II, III, IV, V, VI, VII, VIII and IX respectively. Public extension service providers have strongly associated with SAUs/ICAR research institutes, local/district administrations and media, whereas, less linkage/association was seen with commodity boards, financial institutions and input agencies.

Table 2: Linkages Institutions/Organizations

S. No.	Institutions / Organizations	Public ESP (n=45)		Private ESP (n=45)		NGO ESP n=45)	
		Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank
1	Farmers associations	107	IV	85	III	118	III
2	Commodity boards	75	IX	56	VIII	71	IX
3	Development departments	104	V	125	I	121	II
4	NGOs	99	VI	69	V	125	I
5	Input Agencies	88	VII	59	VI	91	VI
6	Financial institutions	79	VIII	45	IX	87	VIII
7	SAUs / ICAR research Institutions	116	I	57	VII	91	VI
8	Local / District administrations	111	II	74	IV	116	V
9	Media	111	II	114	II	118	III
	Mean	99		76		104	

*Percentages in Parentheses

The findings denotes that public extension service providers had greater association with SAUs/ICAR research institutions, followed by local/district administrations, media; local language papers like Eenaadu, Vaartha and

Andhrajyothi, farmers associations at village level and development departments. Amanor and Farrington (1991) ^[2] expressed that linkage with other institutions and organizations helps to foster accessibility and stronger

accountability of the public and international research centers to their farmer clientele. At the same time they have poor association with commodity boards, financial institutions and input agencies.

The respondents of private extension service providers expressed the extent of linkages with other institutions like development departments (125), media (114), farmers associations (85), local/district administration (74), NGOs (69), input agencies (59), SAUs/ICAR research institutions (57), commodity boards (56) and financial institutions (45) in the order of I, II, III, IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, and IX ranks respectively. Private extension service providers had great linkages with development departments followed by media and farmers associations, while, less linkage with financial institutions, commodity boards and SAUs/ ICAR institutions. The private extension service providers had closer linkages with development departments followed by media; local language papers like Eenaadu, Vaartha and Andhrajyothi, farmers associations, local/district administration and NGOs. While, poor association with financial institutions, commodity boards and SAUs/ ICAR institutions. Private organizations themselves financially strong enough and had their own strong research and development departments.

The respondents of NGO extension service providers stated that linkages with other institutions like NGOs (125), development departments (121), farmers associations (118), media (118), local/district administration (116), SAUs/ICAR institutions (91), input agencies (91), financial agencies (87) and commodity boards (71) and were ranked as I, II, III, IV,

V, VI, VII, VIII and IX respectively. NGO extension service providers had strong association with other NGOs, development departments and farmers associations. Incase of institutions like commodity boards, financial institutions and input agencies, NGO extension service providers had weak association. NGO extension service providers had greater association with other NGOs, followed by development departments, farmers associations, media; local language papers like Eenaadu, Vaartha and Andhrajyothi and local/district administration. Sheela Immanuel and Kanagasabapathy (2005)^[7] reported that more than half of the fishermen were found to have linkage with researchers through reading news paper (61.30%), attending awareness campaigns (58.67%) and seminars (50.67%). Whereas with commodity boards, financial institutions and input agencies, NGO extension service providers had weak association.

Compatibility factors among extension service providers

The results (table 3) revealed that the compatibility factors such as honest and hard work (121) and regular meetings, consultations and discussions (120) ranked first. While, mutual understanding (113), building consensus (101), commitment to action (116), clear objectives (113), attitude towards collectivism (110), change proneness (96), managerial competencies (115) and friendly relationship with others (123) ranked second. Whereas accessing resources and opportunities (105) ranked third, among the eleven compatibility factors identified for the purpose of public extension service providers.

Table 3: Compatibility Factors among the Extension Service Providers

S. No.	Compatibility Factors	Public ESP (n=45)	Private ESP (n=45)	NGO ESP (n=45)
1	Mutual understanding	II (113)	III (104)	I (120)
2	Building consensus	II (101)	III (95)	I (112)
3	Commitment to action	II (116)	III (112)	I (129)
4	Clear objectives	II (113)	III (99)	I (114)
5	Honest and Hard work	I (121)	II (108)	I (121)
6	Regular meetings, consultations and discussions	I (120)	II (112)	I (120)
7	Attitude towards collectivism	II (110)	III (103)	I (113)
8	Change proneness	II (96)	I (117)	III (94)
9	Accessing resources and Opportunities	III (105)	I (113)	II (110)
10	Managerial competencies (planning, leadership, decision making and communication skills)	II (115)	I (130)	II (115)
11	Friendly relationship with others	II (123)	III (121)	I (128)

*Average Score in Parentheses

Compatibility factors such as honest and hard work and regular meetings, consultations and discussions ranked first. While, mutual understanding, building consensus, commitment to action, clear objectives, attitude towards collectivism, change proneness, managerial competencies and friendly relationship with others ranked second. Whereas accessing resources and opportunities ranked third, among the eleven compatibility factors identified for the purpose of public extension service providers.

Regarding private extension service providers, the compatibility factors like; change proneness (117), accessing resources & opportunities (113) and managerial competencies (130) ranked first. Whereas, honest and hard work (108) and regular meetings, consultations and discussions (112), ranked second. While third rank was given to mutual understanding (104), building consensus (95), commitment to action (112), clear objectives (99), attitude towards collectivism (103) and friendly relationship with others (121). In the case of the private extension service providers, the compatibility factors

like; change proneness, accessing resources & opportunities and managerial competencies ranked first, Whereas, honest and hard work and regular meetings, consultations and discussions, ranked second, While third rank was given to mutual understanding, building consensus, commitment to action, clear objectives, attitude towards collectivism and friendly relationship with others.

Where as in case of NGO extension service providers *viz*; mutual understanding (120), building consensus (112), commitment to action (129), clear objectives (114), honest and hard work (121), regular meetings, consultations and discussions (120), attitude towards collectivism (113) and friendly relationship with others (128) ranked first. While, accessing resources & opportunities (110) and managerial competencies (115) got second rank. Third rank was given to change proneness (94) among the eleven compatibility factors.

However regarding the NGO extension service providers the compatibility factors such as mutual understanding, building

consensus, commitment to action, clear objectives, honest and hard work, regular meetings, consultations and discussions, attitude towards collectivism and friendly relationship with others ranked first. Whereas, accessing resources & opportunities and managerial competencies got second rank. Third rank was given to change proneness among the eleven compatibility factors.

The findings revealed factors that have compatibility among the extension service providers when they are working with other similar institutions or organizations. The enlisted compatibility factors have given ranking as expressed by the respondents to the given service provider besides indicating the significant differences among the service providers on the selected compatibility factors.

The results indicated (table 4) that NGO extension service providers (2.69) and public extension service providers (2.53) were significantly superior to private extension service providers (2.31) regarding mutual understanding. Mutual understanding is a critical factor which binds people within and outside organizations to accomplish the delineated goals of the organization and are monitored and evaluated from time to time and this must have made public and NGO extension service providers to work in tandem in several areas. Several government developmental programmes are being implemented through NGO extension service providers. This might be the reason for the significant difference between NGO and Public service providers to that of Private Service providers.

The NGO extension service providers (2.42) were significantly superior to private extension service providers (2.08) in respect to building consensus. Whereas public extension service providers have not differed with NGO and

private extension service providers in building consensus. Because, NGO extension service providers have to work with several other departments where they need assistance essentially from these departments. This aspect made them to build consensus with other extension service providers.

It is evident from the results (table 4) that NGO extension service providers (2.82) were significantly superior to public extension service providers (2.51) and private extension service providers (2.49) in case of commitment to action. It is evident that commitment to action was high in NGO extension service providers and superior to both public extension service providers and private extension service providers. It is obvious that NGO extension service providers recruit those with commitment and service orientation. Such people obviously work with dedication and achieve results through their committed actions reflecting significant difference between NGO service provider with other two.

The results showed (table 4) that NGO extension service providers (2.51) and public extension service providers (2.42) were significantly superior to private extension service providers (2.20) regarding clear objectives. It reveals that there was no difference between the NGO and Public service providers with regard to clear objectives but differed significantly with that of private service providers. The NGO and public service providers have long term goals to bring in desirable changes in their clientele and look for their overall development whereas the private extension service providers which are basically profit oriented exercise flexibility in formulating their objectives depending on the situation. This might be the plausible reason for the significant difference between NGO and public providers with that of private extension service providers.

Table 4: Compatibility among the extension service providers with other similar institutions

S. No	Compatibility factor	Public ESP (n=45)	Private ESP (n=45)	NGO ESP (n=45)	Mean
		Mean score			
1	Mutual understanding	2.53	2.31	2.69	2.51
2	Building consensus	2.22 -----	2.08 -----	2.42	2.44
3	Commitment to action	2.51 -----	2.49 -----	2.82	2.60
4	Clear objectives	2.42	2.20	2.51	2.38
5	Honest and Hard work	2.67	2.40	2.80	2.62
6	Regular meetings, consultations and discussions	2.71	2.49 -----	2.69 -----	2.62
7	Attitude towards collectivism	2.40 -----	2.29 -----	2.62	2.43
8	Change proneness	2.33	2.62	2.29	2.41
9	Accessing resources and opportunities	2.38 -----	2.51 -----	2.53 -----	2.47
10	Managerial competencies	2.56	2.89	2.64	2.69
11	Friendly relationship with others	2.71 -----	2.64 -----	2.84 -----	2.73
	Mean	2.49	2.44	2.62	

Experimental Mean: 2.5226

[Note: Dotted lines represents there was no significant difference among the extension service providers regarding particular compatibility factor]

Control:

S. No.	Factors	Standard Errors	Critical Difference at 0.05 level
1	F1	0.0352	0.0690
2	F2	0.0674	0.1321
3	F1*F2	0.1167	0.2288

The findings (table 4) indicated that NGO extension service providers (2.80) and public extension service providers (2.67) were significantly superior to private extension service providers (2.40) with respect to honest and hard work. The honest and hard work was high in NGO extension service providers and public extension service providers and superior to private extension service providers. It might be due to the fact that the NGO and public extension service providers were seen as service oriented organizations and answerable to public, whereas, private extension service providers were profit making bodies and less responsible when compare with other two extension service providers. This character must have made public and NGO extension service providers to be more honest and put in hard work to accomplish the organizational goal.

The results (table 4) expressed that in case of regular meetings, consultations and discussions, public extension service providers (2.71) were significantly superior to private extension service providers (2.49). The regular meetings, consultations and discussions were high in public extension service providers and superior to private extension service providers. Whereas there was no significant difference between NGO extension service providers and private extension service providers in this compatibility factor. Mean scores of public and NGO extension service providers were high when compared to private extension service providers. These interactions happened through regular meetings, consultations and the public service providers indulge in more interactions, wasting time, money and energy. Generally, they do not avoid the scheduled meetings and discussions. Hence, the significant difference in case of this factor. Whereas private extension service providers have fewer interactions with public and NGO extension service providers

It is observed from the results (table 4) that extension service providers (2.62) were significantly superior to public extension service providers (2.40) and private extension service providers (2.29) with regard to attitude towards collectivism. It could be observed that NGO extension service providers having high disposition towards collectivism and hence significantly superior to public extension service providers and private extension service providers. NGO extension service providers believes in this fundamental principle i.e. collectivism, reflecting unified action to accomplish the give task and also they strive to mobilize people for collective action for various developmental programmes to bring in equality among the beneficiaries. This must be the reason for the positive attitude towards collectivism.

The findings (table 4) showed that private extension service providers (2.62) were significantly superior to public extension service providers (2.33) and NGO extension service providers (2.29) regarding change proneness. It is revealed that change proneness was high in private extension service providers and significantly superior to public extension service providers and NGO extension service providers. Private extension service providers were more flexible organizations when compared to public and NGO extension service providers. Hence, contextual changes were easily possible in private sector organizations in infusing new professionalism or new institutional settings to reap the windfall profits.

The results (table 4) indicated that regarding accessing resources & opportunities there was no significant difference among the three extension service providers i.e. public

extension service providers, private extension service providers and NGO extension service providers. The findings explained that there was no significant difference among the three extension service providers regarding accessing resources & opportunities. Each of the service providers had definite resources and opportunities while starting any programme and formulate tailor made programmes as per the funds or resources.

It could be seen from the results (table 4) that private extension service providers (2.89) were significantly superior to NGO extension service providers (2.64) and public extension service providers (2.56) regarding managerial competencies. It could be inferred that private extension service providers were having high managerial competencies and significantly superior to NGO extension service providers and public extension service providers. Successful management of private extension services organization was purely depends upon level of managerial competencies they possessed. Managerial competencies like efficient planning, dynamic leadership, Skillful decision making and soft communication skills. All the above said qualities could be seen see in private organizations and the significant difference.

The findings (table 4) indicated that incase of friendly relationship with others there was no significant difference among the three extension service providers i.e. public extension service providers, private extension service providers and NGO extension service providers. This denotes that there was no significant difference among the three extension service providers regarding friendly relationship with others. When two organizations working together means there must be some friendly atmosphere exists. Hence, this could be the reason all the three extension service providers were on par with each other.

Significant difference among the three extension service providers regarding over all compatibility factors

The results (table 4) indicated that mean values of three extension service providers of eleven compatibility factors. There was a significant difference among the three extension service providers regarding over all compatibility factors.

The mean values of NGO extension service providers (2.62) were significantly superior to public extension service providers (2.49) and private extension service providers (2.44). Among the three extension service providers NGO extension service providers hold first rank in several compatibility factors. The reason might be smooth and harmonious working nature of NGO extension service providers made more compatible with other extension service providers.

Conclusion

The finding of the study on linkage mechanisms and associations among the three extension service providers revealed that public extension system had strong hold in conducting Trials and demonstrations, DLCC meetings, training programmes and joint field visits/farm visits and more or less same case with private extension system. But in case of NGO extension service providers that they had strong linkage mechanisms in Training programmes, monthly workshops and DLCC meetings were strong linkage mechanisms. Public extension service providers have strongly associated with SAUs/ICAR research institutes, local/district administrations and media. Private extension service

providers had great linkages with development departments followed by media and farmers associations. Whereas NGO extension service providers had strong association with other NGOs, development departments and farmers associations. The findings of this study indicated that among the eleven compatibility factors NGO extension service providers has got first rank in several compatibility factors followed by public extension service providers and private extension service providers. The reason might be working style, flexibility, commitment, areas of work, and management of NGO extension service providers might have made them to have compatibility with public and private extension service providers.

References

1. Abdul Kareem K. Public/Private Linkages in Market led Extension: National Seminar on Extension Pluralism for Rural Development Feb 25-26, 2005 Society of Extension Education TNAU campus Coimbatore, 2005.
2. Amanor K, Frrington. "NGOs and Agricultural Technology Development" in W M Rivera and Gustafson DJ (Eds.) Agricultural Extension: Worldwide Institutional Evolution and Forces for Change London: Elsevier, 1991, Pp. 243-256.
3. Anonymous. Partnership. Extension Digest, Manage, Hyderabad, 1997, 5(2).
4. Mahandra Kumar K, Sekar V. Linkage Mechanisms among different Sub-Systems: National Seminar on Extension Pluralism for Rural Development Feb 25-26, 2005 Society of Extension Education TNAU campus Coimbatore, 2005.
5. Naveen Kumar S, Gidda Reddy P, Ratnakar P. Study on Different Extension Activities Taken up by the Private Extension Service Providers in Andhra Pradesh. The Pharma Innovation Journal, 2021, 4(X).
6. Samanta RK, Sontakki SB. Extension Pluralism for Rural Development Diversity, Performance and Prospects. National Seminar on Extension Pluralism for Rural Development Feb 25-26, Society of Extension Education TNAU campus Coimbatore, 2005.
7. Sheela Immanuel, Kanagasabapathy K. Linkages between Fishermen and Researchers in Marine fisheries- An Analysis Agricultural extension review, 2005, 10-12