

## Source and Channels of Agriculture Information used by the Beneficiary Farmers of NAIP-III

Vijay Kumar<sup>1</sup>, R.S. Prajapati<sup>2</sup>, Akshay Ghintala<sup>3</sup> and Kuldeep Singh<sup>4</sup>

1 M.Sc. Student, 3 & 4 Ex. PG Student, Department of Extension Education

C.P. College of Agriculture, SDAU, Sardarkrushinagar

2 Asst. Prof., Dept. of Ext. Edu., CPCA, SDAU, Sardarkrushinagar

Email: vijaysaharan251@gmail.com

### ABSTRACT

*The adoption requires many kind of information at different stages. Although there are many sources and channels through which people get information about technological change in farming, some of these sources or channels are not efficient comparing the others. So, there is a need to know more about different sources and channels of information through which farmers become aware about the agricultural technologies. The study was conducted to analyze agriculture information utilized by NAIP III beneficiary farmers of Banaskantha district of Gujarat. One hundred twenty respondents were identified based on proportionate random sampling method and data were collected from them using a well-structured and pre-tested interview schedule. The collected data were analysed and tabulated. The finding of the study revealed that there was found that friends and neighbors and progressive farmers were the major personal contact sources of agriculture information utilized. It was also found that Training programmes were the major group contact sources of agriculture information utilized and radio, television and krushi mahotsav were the major mass media contact sources of agriculture information utilized by the NAIP beneficiary farmers for seeking information.*

**Keywords:** Channels, Agriculture information, NAIP

### INTRODUCTION

The India is a country of diversities. The diversity particularly acute among agricultural communities varies from well mechanism and resourceful farmers of Punjab to landless tribal farmers of Gujarat. Transfer of recommended crop technology from research stations to farmers is very important for developing these farming communities.

Communication plays key role in development process. According Berlo (1960), the sole purpose of communication is to influence. People communicate to influence to effect with intent. He says that all communication behavior has its purpose, its goal, as production of response. Lass well (1948) described communication sequence as who says; what, to whom, when, in what manner, under what circumstances and with what effect. The dissemination of any

improved technology depends on how best the information regarding the particular technology is communicated. Today is the era of information explosion. Innumerable information is generated, synthesized and disseminated in each and every moment. Information technology has revolutionized the transfer of information through new ways, *i.e.*, internet, e-mail etc. Information from any part of the world could be easily made available through information technology there by changing the world into global village. Therefore, farmers should be also equally privileged to get informed of farm related information without delay.

Research studies have also shown the importance of effective communication in promoting technological change in farming. The success of agricultural information sources and channels largely depends on their effectiveness

of communication process.

Communication, especially human communication can be categorized into many levels. According to Thayer (1967) there are at least four levels of communication *i.e.*, (i) Intra personnel, (ii) Inter personnel, (iii) Intra organizational and (iv) Inter organizational communication.

Farmers use many information sources and channels for seeking agricultural information on improved farm practices. They may come across large number of information sources and channels but peruse only few of them. Credibility of information sources and channels affects the adoption of farmers. Hence this study was undertaken an objective to know

- 1 To study the personal, socio economic and communicational characteristics of the NAIP III beneficiary farmers.
- 2 To study the agricultural information sources and channels utilized by the NAIP III beneficiary farmers for information seeking in the study area.

### METHODOLOGY

The present study was conducted purposively in Banaskantha district. Among all the talukas of Banaskantha district, Amirgarh and Dantatalukas were selected NAIP III project by Sardarkrushinagar Dantiwada Agricultural University. There were three villages from each talukas were selected purposively on the basis of NAIP III Project, thus total Six villages were selected for making a sample size of 120 respondents.

The present study was confined to “Ex-Post facto” research design. The selected thirteen independent variables were measured by using suitable scales and procedure adopted by various researchers in past with due modification. The size of sample of total 120 respondents was drawn randomly with the help of random sampling procedure. The data were collected with the help of structural and pre-tested interview schedule. The collected data were than analysed, tabulated and interpreted in the light of objectives for arriving at meaningful interpretation and findings.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Characteristics of the respondents

**Table 1 : Distribution of the respondents according to their personal characteristics** n = 120

| Sr. No.                             | Categories   | Number | Per cent |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------|----------|
| <b>Age</b>                          |  |        |          |
| 1                                   | Young (Up to 35 years)   | 17     | 14.67    |
| 2                                   | Middle (between 36 to 50 years)  | 74     | 61.67    |
| 3                                   | Old (Above 50 years)   | 29     | 24.16    |
| <b>Education of the respondents</b> |  |        |          |
| 1                                   | Illiterate   | 60     | 50.00    |
| 2                                   | Primary (1 <sup>st</sup> to 7 <sup>th</sup> std.)                                | 13     | 10.83    |
| 3                                   | Secondary (8 <sup>th</sup> to 10 <sup>th</sup> standard)                         | 19     | 15.84    |
| 4                                   | Higher secondary (11 <sup>th</sup> to 12 <sup>th</sup> standard/ diploma course) | 14     | 11.66    |
| 5                                   | Graduation   | 12     | 10.00    |
| 6                                   | Post-Graduation  | 02     | 01.67    |
| <b>Family size</b>                  |  |        |          |
| 1                                   | Joint  | 87     | 72.50    |
| 2                                   | Nuclear  | 33     | 27.50    |
| <b>Social participation</b>         |  |        |          |
| 1                                   | No membership  | 33     | 27.50    |
| 2                                   | Membership in one organization   | 49     | 40.83    |
| 3                                   | Membership in more than one organization   | 36     | 30.00    |
| 4                                   | Holding position   | 02     | 1.67     |
| <b>Land holding</b>                 |  |        |          |
| 1                                   | Marginal farmers (Up to 1.00 ha)   | 85     | 70.83    |
| 2                                   | Small farmers (1.01 to 2.0 ha)   | 26     | 21.67    |
| 3                                   | Semi-medium (2.01 to 4.0 ha)   | 06     | 5.00     |
| 4                                   | Medium farmers (4.01 to 10.00)   | 03     | 2.50     |
| 5                                   | Large farmers (Above 10.0 ha)  | 00     | 0.00     |
| <b>Farming Experience</b>           |  |        |          |
| 1                                   | More than 10 years   | 106    | 88.67    |
| 2                                   | Less than 10 years   | 14     | 11.33    |
| <b>Occupation</b>                   |  |        |          |
| 1                                   | Only farming   | 10     | 08.33    |
| 2                                   | Farming + agricultural labourer  | 16     | 13.33    |
| 3                                   | Farming + animal husbandry   | 83     | 69.17    |
| 4                                   | Farming + business   | 07     | 05.84    |
| 5                                   | Farming + service  | 04     | 03.33    |

| Sr. No.              | Categories                                   | Number | Per cent |
|----------------------|--|--------|----------|
| <b>Annual income</b> |  |        |          |
| 1                    | Low (up to ₹ 76,000/-)                       | 17     | 14.17    |
| 2                    | Medium (between ₹ 76,001/- to Rs 2,44,000/-) | 82     | 68.33    |
| 3                    | High (above ₹ 2,44,000/-)                    | 21     | 17.50    |

The data depicted in Table 1 show that maximum number of beneficiary respondents (61.67 per cent) were found in middle age group, followed by old age (24.16 per cent) beneficiary. Remaining 14.67 per cent beneficiary farmers were found in young age, respectively.

### Education

The data presented in Table 1 indicated that half of (50.00 per cent) beneficiary farmers were having illiterates, while 15.84 per cent respondents were found having educated up to middle school level. On the other hand 10.83 per cent of them were found educated up to primary education. A very meager number of respondents were having educated up to high school 11.66 per cent, and 10.00 per cent were found having education graduation level. There were only 1.67 per cent beneficiary farmers each who were having post graduate degree.

### Type of family

The data presented in Table 1 reveal that above half of the beneficiary (55.83 per cent) were having belonged to medium size of family followed by small size of family 28.33 per cent and large family size 15.84 per cent.

### Family size

The data presented in Table 1 indicate that near to one third of beneficiary (72.50 per cent) were having belonged to jointfamilies and rest 27.50 per cent beneficiary belonged to the nuclear families.

### Social participation

The data depicted in Table 2 show that maximum number of beneficiary respondents (40.83 per cent) were membership in one organization, followed by membership in more than one organization (30.00 per cent) and 27.50 per cent beneficiary farmers were not associated with any social organization. Remaining only 1.67 per cent beneficiary farmers were found holding position in various social organization.

### Land holding

The data presented in Table 1 indicate that majority

(70.83 per cent) of the beneficiary farmers were in marginal farmer categories having up to 1.00 ha. of cultivable land. On the other hand, 21.67 per cent beneficiary were small farmers categories having 1.01 to 2.00 ha. The percentage of semi-medium farmers (2.01 to 4.0 ha) and medium farmers (4.01 to 10.00) beneficiary farmers were 5.00 per cent and 2.50 per cent respectively. There were no found large farmers (0.00).

### Farming Experience

The data presented in Table 1 revealed that majority of 88.67 per cent of the respondents were having more than 10 years farming experience and 11.33 per cent of the respondents were having less than 10 years farming experience.

### Occupation

Data presented in Table 1 indicate that 69.17 per cent of the respondents were having farming plus animal husbandry as their main occupation followed by 13.33 per cent having Farming + agricultural labourer as their occupation and 8.33 per cent having only farming occupation. Remaining 5.84 per cent farmers were having farming plus business as their occupation and 3.33 per cent respondents were having farming plus service as their occupation.

### Annual income

The data depicted in Table 1 show that maximum number of beneficiary respondents (68.33 per cent) had medium annual income between ₹ 76,001/- to ₹ 2,44,000/- . Nearly one fifth number of respondents (17.50 per cent) had high income i.e. above ₹ 2, 44,000/-. Remaining 14.17 per cent beneficiary farmers had low annual income of up to ₹ 76,000/-.

**Table: 2 : Sources of agriculture information utilized by respondents for seeking information n = 120**

| Sr. No. | Personal Contact Sources          | M P S | Rank |
|---------|-----------------------------------|-------|------|
| 1       | Personal contact with AA/AAO      | 38.33 | VI   |
| 2       | Personal contact AHO/ HA          | 37.50 | VII  |
| 3       | Personal letter                   | 11.66 | X    |
| 4       | Office call                       | 11.66 | X    |
| 5       | Telephone call                    | 17.50 | IX   |
| 6       | Contact with progressive farmers  | 65.83 | III  |
| 7       | Contact with agro Service Centers | 59.16 | IV   |
| 8       | Friends                           | 95.00 | I    |
| 9       | Neighbors                         | 82.50 | II   |
| 10      | University scientist              | 23.33 | VIII |
| 11      | Private extension officer         | 42.50 | V    |

| Sr. No. | Group Contact Sources                       | M P S | Rank |
|---------|---|-------|------|
| 1       | Group discussion and meeting                | 37.50 | II   |
| 2       | Training programmes                         | 65.00 | I    |
| 3       | Discussion with fellow farmers              | 31.66 | III  |
| 4       | Field day                                   | 28.33 | IV   |
| 5       | Field trip                                  | 15.83 | V    |
| Sr. No. | Mass Media Sources                          | M P S | Rank |
| 1       | Radio                                       | 67.50 | I    |
| 2       | Television                                  | 64.16 | II   |
| 3       | News paper                                  | 09.16 | VII  |
| 4       | Agricultural magazine                       | 06.66 | VIII |
| 5       | Krishimela                                  | 35.00 | V    |
| 6       | Exhibition                                  | 14.50 | VI   |
| 7       | Tradition media (Puppet, Local song, Drama) | 37.50 | IV   |
| 8       | Krushimahotsav                              | 61.00 | III  |
| 9       | Internet                                    | 01.66 | IX   |

The data presented in Table 2 depicted that friends (MPS 95.00) and neighbors (MPS 82.50) were the major personal locality sources of agriculture information utilized by majority of beneficiary farmers for seeking information on improved farm practices and were accorded first and second ranks, respectively. Table 19 clearly revealed that personal letter and office call (MPS 11.66) was least preferred information source as perceived by the beneficiary farmers. It is apparent from the table that friends were most utilized personal localite sources of information.

It is clear from the data incorporated in Table 2 that training programmes (MPS 65.00) was the major group contact source for seeking agriculture information utilization. Group discussion and meetings (MPS 37.50), discussion with fellow farmers (MPS 31.66), field day (MPS 28.33) and field trip (MPS 15.83) were ranked second, third, fourth and fifth respectively.

Table 2 clearly indicated that radio (MPS 67.50), television (MPS 64.16), Krushimahotsav (MPS 61.00), traditional media (puppet, local songs, drama) (MPS 37.50), and Krushimela (35.00) were the most preferred impersonal cosmopolite channels (mass media source) of agricultural information as perceived by the beneficiary farmers in the study area. It was expected that radio and television would be preferred by beneficiary farmers, specially by tribal respondents for seeking agriculture information, but the results clearly indicated that news paper were least preferred impersonal cosmopolite channel among tribal respondents. Agriculture magazine (MPS 6.6) and email-internet (MPS 1.66)

were utilized by less number of respondents for seeking agriculture information in the study area.

In other words, it is concluded that radio, television and krushimahotsav were the most popular mass media sources for seeking of agriculture information by the beneficiary farmers in the study area.

## REFERENCES

- Agwu A. E. and Adeniran A. A. (2009). Sources of Agricultural Information Used by Arable Crop Farmers in IsaleOsun Farm Settlement, Osogbo Local Government Area of Osun State *Journal of Agricultural Extension, Vol. 13* (1) :24-34.
- AsumingBrempong S. and Franklin N. (2012). Analysis of cocoa-based agricultural knowledge and information systems in the eastern region of ghana. *Russian journal of agricultural and socio-economic sciences, 2*(14) :1-10.
- Berlo David, K. (1960). Process of communication, Holt KinehartWinstion, New York.
- Daudu, S., Chado, S. S. and Igbashal, A. A. (2009). Agricultural information sources utilized by farmers in benue state, Nigeria, University Library, University of Agriculture, Makurdi, Nigeria, *PAT 2009; 5* (1) : 39-48.
- Dhayal B. L., Khan I. M., and Jangid M.K. (2012). information seeking behaviour of ber growers in Jaipur district of Rajasthan, *Raj. J. Extn. Edu. 20* : 57-60.
- Gunawardana, A.M.A.P.G and Sharma, V. P., (2005). Information source credibility among tribal and non-tribal farmers. *Raj. J. Extn. Edu. 14* : 82-85.
- Lasswell, H.D. (1948). The communication of ideas, institute of religious and social studies, New York.
- Opera, N. U. (2008). Agricultural information sources used by farmers in Imo state, Nigeria. *Info. Dev., 24*(4): 289-295.
- Thayer, L. (1967). Communication and perspectives, Macmillan and co., London.
- Yadav B. S., Khan I. M. and Kumar M. (2011). Utilization pattern of different sources and channels of agriculture information used by the fenugreek growers, *Indian Res. J. Ext. Edu. 11* (1) :44-49.