

PREFERENCES OF FARMERS TO DIFFERENT SOURCES AND CHANNELS IN PIPRALI PANCHAYAT SAMITI OF DISTRICT SIKAR, RAJASTHAN

I. M. Khan*, Vikram Singh** and Suresh Garhwal***

ABSTRACT

Present study was conducted purposively selected Piprali panchayat samiti of Bikar district of Rajasthan because the farmers of this panchayat samiti were having highest contact to development department. 100 respondents was selected through proportionate random sampling procedure. The study indicates that the sources which were perceived as most important for information seeking about farm praction were neighours, private agencies and agriculture supervisors. The channels perceived as most important for information seeking about package of practices were group discussion, television and group meeting.

INTRODUCTION

Rural people are not only in need of information regarding agriculture and animal husbandry but they are interested in all kinds of information, which help them for their development. India has one of the largest and most complex public systems for generation, testing and transfer of agricultural information. Though a large number of sources and channels of agricultural information are available for disseminating the agricultural messages, it is of utmost importance to know the choice and preferences of farmers attached to different sources aid channels in their socio-economic set up.

The Sikar district is one of the districts, having one Krishi Vigyan Kendra and one Agriculture Research Station. This district having third rank in literacy and first rank in water use efficiency in Rajasthan. Keeping all these facts in mind the present investigation "Preferences of Farmers to Different Sources and Channels in Piprali Panchayat Samiti of District Sikar, Rajasthan" was under taken to know the choices and preferences of farmers to different sources and channels in their socio-economic set up.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study was conducted in purposively selected Piprali panchayat samiti of Sikar district of Rajasthan because the farmers of this panchayat samiti were having highest contact to development departments. From Piprali panchayat samiti, five gram panchayat were selected randomly. In the next stage of sampling ten villages, two each from five gram panchayas were selected randomly, and a sample of 100 respondents was selected through proportionate random sampling procedure. The data were collected with the help of deliberately developed interview schedule by personal interview mode. To measure the preferences of farmers to different sources and channels by which information was used by farmers, a scale was developed by the investigator by getting expert opinion and following the recommended procedure of scale development. By implementing scale, preferences of farmers were assessed for different sources and channels for obtaining information. The data so collected were then classified, tabulated and inferences were drawn after subjecting the data to appropriate statistical analysis.

* Assistant Professor, Department of Extension Education, S.K.N. College of Agriculture, Jobner, Distt. Jaipur.

** Post Graduate, Department of Extension Education, S.K.N. College of Agriculture, Jobner, DisEt. Jaipur.

*** Post Graduate, Department of Extension Education, SACN. College of Agriculture, Jobner, Distt. Jaipur.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

For measuring this aspect a scale consisting of sources and channels of information was constructed and the responses were collected on a four-point continuum namely, most important,

important, less important and not important. The mean scores for each of the sources and channels were calculated and the sources and the channels were ranked according to their respective mean scores. The results have been presented in table 1 and 2.

Table 1. Comparative importance of information sources as perceived by farmers n = 100

S. No.	Source of Information	Most Important	Important	Less Important	Not Important	Mean Score	Rank
1.	A.O.	0	10	15	75	0.35	XI
2.	A.A.O.	5	16	18	61	0.65	IX
3.	Agriculture Supervisors	30	50	13	7	2.03	III
4.	Friends	17	75	8	0	1.92	V
5.	Neighbours	66	29	5	0	2.61	I
6.	Private agencies	39	57	4	0	2.35	II
7.	Progressive farmers	31	40	24	5	1.97	IV
8.	Relatives	24	32	28	28	1.64	VII
9.	Research stations	0	6	14	80	0.26	XII
10.	NGOs	5	13	7	75	0.48	X
11.	Agriculture graduates	25	13	35	0	1.90	VI
12.	ATIC	7	15	22	66	0.73	VIII

Table 1 reveal that the source "neighbours" was given highest importance by the farmers and was ranked first with the mean score 2.61 as it was perceived most important by 66 per cent farmers, important by 29 per cent farmers, less important by 5 per cent farmers and non of the farmer perceived it was not important. The "private agencies" was ranked second with mean score 2.35, whereas the "agriculture supervisor" got third rank with mean score 2.03. The "relatives" (1.97 MS) was ranked fourth followed by "friends" (1.92 MS), "ATIC", (0.73MS), "A.A.Os" (0.65 MS), "agriculture graduates" (0.48 MS) and "A.Os" (0.35 MS). The "NGOs" (0.26 MS) was given least importance by the farmers as it was not common among the farmers in the study area.

The findings revealed that "neighbours" got the first place in order of preference. This might be due to the fact that the farmers remain more time in contact with neighbours. The new technologies employed on neighbours field can easily be seen by the farmers with his own eyes and may easily be implemented in the same situation on their field. Proving the principle of seeing is believing farmers believed more that they see on neighbours' field and inquires more and more about the improved practices from the neighbours.

The "private agencies" were ranked second

in order of preference. This might be due the reason that the 'private agencies' strive to increase sale of the agricultural inputs, so they remain more in contact with private agencies which are easily accessible to the farmers in their locality and play dual role of providing product and consultancy services.

The "agriculture supervisor" was ranked third in order of preference which might be due to the reason that the "agriculture supervisor" is a technical person appointed by government to assist farmers and provides agricultural information so the farmers are attracted towards him but his availability is limited due to vast number of farmers under a single supervisor, hence instead of being important source it was placed at third position.

The "NGOs" was last in preference of rank order. This might be due to the reason that in the study area none of the NGO was working on agricultural activities, so farmer may not have knowledge about it. Hence they might not have perceived the "NGOs" as an important source of information.

Data in table 2 reveal that the "group discussion" was given first rank by the farmers with the mean score 2.48, as it was perceived most important by 54 per cent farmers, important by 40 per cent farmers, less important by 6 per cent farmers

and none of the farmers perceived it as not important channel of information. The "television" was ranked second with mean score 2.36, whereas the "group meetings" got third rank with mean score 2.20. The "radio" (2.10 MS) was ranked fourth followed by "news paper" (2.09 MS), "farmers training" (1.83 MS), "kisan mela"(1.61 MS), "result and method demonstrations" (1.59 MS), "exhibition"

(1.59 MS), "literature" (1.52 MS) and "posters/ charts/ circulars" (1.08 MS). The "field day/ field visit" (0.63 MS), was given least importance by the farmers, as it was perceived not important by 63 per cent farmers, less important by 18 per cent farmers important by 12 per cent farmers and only 7 per cent farmers perceived it as the most important channel of information.

Table 2. Comparative importance of information channels as perceived by farmers

n = 100

S. No.	Channel of Information	Most Important	Important	Less Important	Not Important	Mean Score	Rank
1.	Television	44	48	8	0	2.36	II
2.	Radio	40	35	20	5	2.10	IV
3.	News paper	29	56	10	5	2.09	V
4.	Literature	20	28	36	16	1.52	IX
5.	Kisan mela	19	36	32	13	1.61	VII
6.	Farmer's training	30	36	23	11	1.85	VI
7.	Group discussion	54	40	6	0	2.48	I
8.	Group meetings	38	44	18	0	2.20	III
9.	Poster/Charts /Circulars	13	19	31	37	1.08	X
10.	Fieldday/Fieldvisit	7	12	18	63	0.63	XI
11.	Result and Method	18	37	31	12	1.59	VIII
12.	demonstration	20	33	33	14	1.59	VIII

The findings revealed that the farmers perceived "group discussion" as the most important channel of information and accorded the first place in order of preference. This might be due to the reason that in the group discussion the farmers recognize a common problem and exchange and evaluate the information and ideas in an effort to solve that problem. Their efforts may be directed towards a better understanding of the problem. Discussion usually occurs in a face-to-face or coaching situation with the exchange being spoken. Hence, the farmers understand the information more clearly in-group discussion.

The "television" was ranked second most important channel in order of preference. This might be due to the reason that most of the farmers were having television sets for getting knowledge about farm practices. For disseminating new technology and for providing solution of farmers problems Doordarshan telecast some special programmes eg. Chaupal, Krishi darshan, movies on field sites etc. The "group meetings" was ranked third most important channel by the farmers in order of preference. This might be due to the fact that the group meeting is a common practice in farming

community to sit together in village yard and discuss about problems and solutions.

The "posters/charts/circulars" was perceived least important channel by the farmers which might be due to the unavailability of "posters/ charts/ circulars" to the extension agencies and lack of proper distribution to them.

CONCLUSION

1. The sources which were perceived as most important for information seeking about farm practices were "neighbours", 'private agencies" and "agriculture supervis where as the least important sources were "NGOs" and "ATIC".
2. The channels perceived as most important for information seeking about package of practices were "group discussion", "television" and "group meeting", whereas the least important channels were "field day/ field visit" and "posters/charts/circulars".

REFERENCES

Ani, A.O. and Kwaghe, P.V. 1997. Sources of information

- on improved farm practices : study of farmers in Umuahia zone of Alia state Nigeria. *Agroserch*, 3 (1-2) : 1-10
- Das, P.K. and Sharma, J.K. 1998. Credibility pattern of different sources of farm information. *Journal of Agriculture Science Society of North east India*, 11(1):121—123.
- Galindo, G.C. 1994. Communication media used by farmers in the central region of Zacateca, Maxico. *Turriabla*, 44 (3): 140-146.
- Goswami, A., Ray, N., Mazumdar, A.K., Gosh, S.K. and Duttagupta, R. 2001. Study of utilization of mass media and personal cosmopolite source of information in animal husbandry practices. *Indian Journal of Animal Health*, 40(1): 62-72.
- Marimuthu, P. and Radhakrishna, T. 2000. Information utilization pattern of Banana growers. *Agricultural Extension Reviews*, 5 (9-10) : 22-25.

