

Credibility of Information Sources as Perceived by Trained and Untrained Farmers

G.M. Patel¹ and R.A. Gaur²

INTRODUCTION

The communication plays an important role in convincing farmers about the usefulness of technology for acceptance and adoption of the same. It also helps in bridging the gap between research and farming system through use of various communication media. For getting awareness of the new technology also, farmers make use of various communication sources which are available to them and which are of high credibility. Thus, the farmers usually have different communication behaviour in regard to utilization of the communication sources. Hence, this study has been undertaken to determine the credibility of the various sources as perceived and utilized by the trained and untrained farmers for obtaining the information of new technology. Keeping this in view the study was undertaken with the objective : "To know the credibility of information sources in communicating wheat technology for final adoption of the practices".

METHODOLOGY

The present study was conducted in Kundam Block of Jabalpur District. Out of 13 blocks of Jabalpur District, Kundam block had been purposively selected due to having maximum number of trained farmers trained during the year 1985-86. Five villages of Kundam block were selected from where the farmers attended the training during the year 1985-86 of

Farmer's Training Centre, Jabalpur. All the trained farmers were selected from each of the selected villages and equal number of untrained farmers were randomly selected. Thus, the total respondents for the study were 206 (103 trained and 103 untrained). The data were collected by personal interview technique. Three practices viz. improved varieties, fertilizers and plant protection measures were selected in the study. The specific source of information which has been considered as the first source of information about improved varieties, fertilizers and plant protection measures in wheat technology have been presented in Table 1. Among personal localite sources, village leaders for trained farmers and neighbours for untrained farmers were the first source of information for improved varieties as reported by 5.83 per cent and 12.62 per cent farmers respectively. As regards fertilizer practices, village leaders and neighbours were first source of information reported as same i.e. 2.91 per cent in trained and 8.74 per cent in untrained farmers respectively. About plant protection measures, relatives and neighbours were the source of information reported as 9.71 per cent and 3.88 per cent trained and untrained farmers respectively.

Among personal cosmopolite sources, the VLW was the first source of information for improved varieties as reported by 76.7 per cent and 53.4 per cent trained and

¹ Assistant Extension Educationist (AV), EEI, G.A.U., Anand.

² Retd. Prof. of Extension Education, J.N.K.V.V., Jabalpur (M.P.).

Table 1. The first source of information for improved varieties, fertilizers and plant protection measures among trained and untrained farmers

N = 103

Source	Improved varieties		Fertilizers		Plant protection measures	
	Trained	Untrained	Trained	Untrained	Trained	Untrained
Personal localite						
Village leaders	6 (5.83)	7 (6.8)	3 (2.91)	3 (2.91)	3 (2.91)	-
Relatives	3 (2.91)	9 (8.74)	2 (1.94)	4 (3.88)	10 (9.71)	-
Friends	2 (1.95)	8 (7.77)	2 (1.94)	9 (8.74)	8 (7.77)	2 (1.94)
Neighbours	1 (0.97)	13 (12.62)	3 (2.91)	9 (8.74)	7 (6.80)	4 (3.88)
Personal cosmopolite						
VLWs	79 (76.7)	55 (53.4)	69 (66.99)	52 (50.49)	53 (51.46)	22 (21.36)
AEOs	2 (1.94)	4 (3.88)	-	-	6 (5.83)	2 (1.94)
SADOs	1 (0.97)	1 (0.97)	-	-	-	-
Panchayat	-	1 (0.97)	1 (0.97)	1 (0.97)	1 (0.97)	-
Co-operatives	-	2 (1.94)	15 (14.56)	21 (20.39)	-	-
Mass Media						
Radio	4 (3.88)	2 (1.94)	5 (4.85)	3 (2.91)	8 (7.77)	2 (1.94)
Printed material	3 (2.91)	-	-	-	-	-
Demonstration	2 (1.95)	1 (0.97)	-	-	5 (4.85)	-
Exhibition	-	-	3 (2.91)	1 (0.97)	2 (1.94)	-

Note : Figures in bracket indicate percentage.

untrained farmers respectively. While for fertilizers, 66.99 per cent and 50.40 per cent trained and untrained farmers respectively and for plant protection measures 51.46 per cent and 21.36 per cent reported by trained and untrained farmers respectively.

Among mass media sources, Radio was the first source of information for the both group of farmers reported 3.88 per cent and 1.94 per cent for improved varieties, 4.85 per cent and 2.91 per cent for fertilizers and 7.77 per cent and 1.94

per cent for plant protection measures trained and untrained farmers respectively.

While considering the sources of information, it may be concluded that, the village level worker (VLW) was the first source of information for selected three practices of wheat technology in both groups of farmers.

The data presented in Table 2 indicate that, extent of utilization of information sources by the trained and untrained farmers for selected three practices of wheat cultivation. Among personal localite

Table 2. Extent of utilization of information sources by the trained and untrained farmers for improved varieties, fertilizers and plant protection measures.

N = 103

Source	Improved varieties		Fertilizers		Plant protection measures	
	Trained	Untrained	Trained	Untrained	Trained	Untrained
Personal localite						
Neighbours	13 (12.62)	15 (14.56)	11 (10.68)	11 (10.68)	15 (14.56)	3 (2.91)
Relatives	4 (3.88)	7 (6.8)	6 (5.83)	7 (6.8)	17 (16.5)	2 (1.94)
Friends	8 (7.77)	13 (12.62)	10 (9.71)	5 (4.95)	18 (17.48)	5 (4.85)
Village leaders	11 (10.68)	14 (13.59)	3 (2.91)	9 (8.74)	7 (6.8)	4 (3.88)
Personal cosmopolite						
VLWs	82 (76.61)	80 (77.67)	81 (78.64)	74 (71.84)	83 (80.58)	24 (23.3)
AEOs	56 (54.37)	34 (33.01)	46 (44.66)	25 (24.27)	53 (51.46)	11 (10.68)
SADOs	2 (1.94)	3 (2.91)	3 (2.91)	4 (3.88)	3 (2.91)	2 (1.94)
Panchayat	4 (3.88)	5 (4.85)	5 (4.85)	5 (4.85)	4 (3.88)	1 (0.97)
Co-operatives	1 (0.97)	11 (10.68)	36 (34.95)	44 (42.72)	1 (0.97)	1 (0.97)
Mass Media						
Radio	54 (52.43)	28 (27.18)	44 (42.72)	37 (35.92)	39 (37.86)	13 (12.62)
Exhibition	5 (4.85)	2 (1.94)	6 (5.83)	2 (1.94)	3 (2.91)	1 (0.97)
Demonstration	11 (10.68)	11 (10.68)	6 (5.83)	3 (2.91)	9 (8.74)	3 (2.91)
Printed material	7 (6.8)	1 (0.97)	1 (0.97)	2 (1.94)	-	-

Note : Figures in bracket indicate percentage.

sources, the neighbours were utilized by most of the farmers of both the groups for improved varieties and fertilizers reported as many as, 12.62 per cent and 10.68 per cent for trained and 14.56 per cent and 10.68 per cent for untrained farmers respectively. While plant protection measures, friends were utilized by most of farmers reported as 17.48 per cent and 4.85 per cent for trained and untrained farmers respectively.

Among personal cosmopolite, VLW was utilized by most of the farmers of the

both groups for all selected three practices reported as 76.61, 78.64 and 80.58 per cent for trained and 77.67 and 77.67 per cent 71.84 and 23.30 per cent for untrained farmers, respectively.

Among mass media, radio was utilized by most of the farmers of both the groups for all selected three practices reported as 52.43, 42.72 and 37.86 per cent for trained and 27.18, 35.92 and 12.62 per cent for untrained farmers respectively.

While considering the all sources of information it was noted that VLW was

most utilized source of information by both the groups of farmers. Radio was considered next to VLWs as reported by farmers of both the groups.

The data presented in Table 3 indicate the credibility of the information sources as perceived by the trained and untrained farmers for selected three practices of wheat technology.

Among personal localite category the highest credibility was of neighbours for both the groups of farmers for improved varieties and fertilizers practices while for plant protection measures friends was most credible source for both the groups.

Among personal cosmopolite sources, VLWs and from mass media sources, the radio was the most credible source of in-

Table 3. Credibility of the information sources as perceived by trained and untrained farmers for improved varieties, fertilizers and plant protection measures.

N = 103

	Improved varieties		Fertilizers		Plant protection measures							
	Trained	Untrained	Trained	Untrained	Trained	Untrained						
	Total Rank Score	Total Rank Score	Total Rank Score	Total Rank Score	Total Rank Score	Total Rank Score						
Personal localite												
Neighbours	34	I	41	I	28	i	32	I	39	III	8	III
Village leaders	28	II	34	II	8	IV	23	II	19	IV	11	II
Friends	19	III	33	III	24	II	13	IV	47	I	13	I
Relatives	12	IV	19	IV	18	III	20	III	43	II	5	IV
Personal cosmopolite												
VLWs	234	I	229	I	230	I	211	I	234	I	65	I
AEOs	138	II	87	II	105	II	62	III	130	II	27	II
Panchayat	9	III	11	IV	11	IV	9	V	7	IV	2	V
SADOs	5	IV	7	V	9	V	10	IV	8	III	4	III
Co-operatives	1	V	28	III	79	III	107	II	1	V	3	IV
Mass Media												
Radio	148	I	80	I	117	I	99	I	105	I	36	I
Demonstration	29	II	27	II	13	II	8	II	20	II	9	II
Printed materials	15	III	-	-	2	IV	1	IV	3	IV	-	-
Exhibition	14	IV	3	III	12	III	7	III	6	III	2	III

formation in both the group of farmers for all selected practices.

While considering the all sources VLW was the most credible source of information for both the group of the farmers for all selected practices of wheat technology.

CONCLUSION

It can be concluded that out of all sources, the VLW was the first source of information for selected three practices of wheat technology in both groups of farmers.

While considering utilization of all sources, VLW was most utilized source of information by both the groups of farmers whereas radio was considered next to VLW as reported by farmers of both the groups.

Among all the sources, VLW was the most credible source of information for both the groups of the farmers for all selected practices of wheat technology.

REFERENCE

- Patel, G.M. 1988. Communication behaviour of farmers in utilization of information sources for wheat technology in Kundam block of Jabalpur District (M.P.). Unpublished M.Sc. Thesis, J.N.K.V.V., Jabalpur.
- Singh, I.B. and Sahay, B.N. 1972. Communication behaviour and social changes, Book HIVE, New Delhi-8.